A4425-2F 11/86

THE COUNCIL OF THE GREAT CITY SCHOOLS
1413 K. Street, N.W., 4th Floor, Washington, D.C. 20005 / (202) 371-0163

Albuquerque
Atlanta
Baltimore
Boston
Buffalo
Chicago
Cincinnati
Cleveland
Columbus
Dade County
Dallas
Denver
Detroit
Fresno
Indianapolis
Long Beach
Los Angeles
Memphis
Milwaukee
Minneapolis
Nashville
New Orleans
New York City
Norfolk
Oakland
Omaha
Philadelphia
Pittsburgh
Portland
Rochester
St. Louis
St. Paul
San Francisco
Seattle
Toledo
Tulsa
Washington, D.C.

SPECIAL EDUCATION:

VIEWS FROM AMERICA'S CITIES

November, 1986

A STUDY OF SPECIAL EDUCATION:

VIEWS FROM AMERICA'S CITIES

Sponsored by
The Council of the Great City Schools (CGCS)

CGCS Study Directors

James Lytle, Executive Director of
Planning, Research & Evaluation
School District of Philadelphia

William Penn, Director
Division for Exceptional Children
Pittsburgh Board of Education

Conducted by
Research for Better Schools (RBS)

RBS Study Staff

Joan Buttram
Senior Evaluator

Keith Kershner
Director of Research

Steven Rioux
Research Assistant

RBS

444 North Third Street, Philadelphia, PA 19123

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The Council of the Great City Schools special education study represents the work of a large group of people. First, Dr. James Lytle, Executive Director of Planning, Research, and Evaluation in the School District of Philadelphia and Dr. William Penn, Director of Special Education in Pittsburgh, have served as the study directors for this effort for the Council. Assistance and guidance were provided by a steering committee of 12 special education directors from Council districts. They included: Dr. David Burket, District of Columbia Public Schools; Mr. Frank Davis, Long Beach Unified School District; Ms. Ingrid Draper, Detroit Public Schools; Mr. Edward Friedlander, Baltimore City Public Schools; Mr. Thomas Hehir, Boston Public Schools; Dr. Keith Kromer, Minneapolis Public Schools; Mr. Theodore Lewis, Chicago Public Schools; Dr. William Malloy, Milwaukee Public Schools; Mr. Edward Serimier, New York City Public Schools; Dr. Win Tillery, School District of Philadelphia; Dr. Ruth Turner, Dallas Independent School District; and Ms. Venetta Witaker, Los Angeles Unified School District. All 33 districts deserve special thanks for the countless hours they devoted to gathering the data they submitted to RBS. In addition, Dr. Samuel Husk, Executive Director of the Council, provided counsel, assistance and support. Carol Crociante and Peter Kerwin of RBS ably assisted in the word processing and statistical calculations. Without the unselfish help of all of these individuals, this study would not have been possible.

ABSTRACT

In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools commissioned a study of special education operations in its 35 member districts. The study was designed and conducted by member districts' directors of special education and research and Research for Better Schools, Inc. Information was collected using survey techniques with follow-up validation by responding districts - 33 of the 35 Council members.

The extensive descriptive results were organized by seven themes which characterized the findings:

- variation in local implementation of P.L. 94-142
- magnitude of the referral, evaluation, and placement process
- limited exit from special education programs
- limited participation in vocational education programs
- involvement of special education in district decision-making
- need for impact data to evaluate special education programs
- recommendations for special education policy makers.

The study findings led to conclusions regarding six issues which confront special education programs in the cities studied:

- The variation from district to district was seen in the percent of students enrolled in special education, the percent classified in various handicapping categories, and funding levels and sources. These differences reflect local needs and make it difficult to compare cities or portray the typical district.
- The referral, evaluation, and placement process represents a significant demand on special education resources, thus detracting from treatment capability. On average, twice as many students as are placed are referred for evaluation.

- The largest number of students identified as handicapped were in the specific learning disabled category. It seems likely that this category is sometimes misused for placement of average ability students with poor performance or motivation problems.

- Special education directors see increasing numbers of "at-risk" students referred to special education due to a lack of options in regular programs. Increasing numbers of referrals and overuse of the specific learning disability category support this view. Options other than special education placement are needed for these students.

- The participation rate in vocational programs for handicapped students is far below that of non-handicapped students; better access is needed.

- Evaluation of the success of special education programs in terms of student outcomes is a difficult but needed task.

Three recommendations for future Council work were offered:

- develop a longitudinal data base on special education

- explore options to integrate regular and special education programs

- identify and disseminate successful school district practices.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Over the past few years, many urban school districts have become concerned about the mission, roles, and effectiveness of special education programs. In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools directed the Council to examine these issues. In response, Council members' directors of special education and research, in collaboration with Research for Better Schools, Inc. (RBS), have designed a three-phase study that:

- collects and analyzes descriptive information on the special education operations of member districts (Phase I)
- investigates member-nominated effective special education practices in-depth, documents the best among them, and disseminates detailed descriptions to Council members and other districts (Phase II)
- assesses the efficacy of special education programs for special needs students (Phase III).

This document reports completion of the first phase of the study.

Methodology

All 35 special education directors in the Council were sent a survey and cover letter inviting them to participate in the study in January, 1986. A total of 33 districts (94 percent) agreed to participate by returning the initial survey.

The survey was developed by the Council study directors and RBS staff and reviewed by special education and research directors. It collected 1984-85 school year information on students; staff and facilities; fiscal and budget; pre-referral, referral, placement, and exit; program evaluation; vocational education; related services; and remedial and compensatory programs. Survey information was submitted to RBS via copies of existing reports and materials (e.g., P.L. 94-142 report to the SEA) or original

information (e.g., number of referrals) in either statistical or narrative formats. This information was organized into tabular listings for each survey question which presented data by individual districts. A total of 19 statistical and 23 narrative listings were produced from the survey information collected.

Both the statistical and narrative listings were reviewed with the Council study directors and a group of 12 special education directors in mid-June of 1986. Based on their feedback, revisions were made in the range of information collected on particular categories and two categories were completely eliminated--special education staffing patterns and remedial and compensatory education.

The 33 participating districts were sent the revised statistical and narrative listings and asked to verify or correct their responses. Verification and corrections were returned by 64 percent of the districts. Another 21 percent were verified by telephone and the original responses were used for the remaining 15 percent.

These verified statistical and narrative listings served as the data base for all analyses. Simple descriptive statistics were calculated for the quantitative data listings. Categories were developed for coding each district's narrative responses and then frequency counts and percentages were calculated.

The study directors and a subgroup of the special education directors reviewed these analyses in October to ensure the accuracy of the data set and to identify underlying themes or issues and their implications for special education. These themes were used to organize the study findings presented below.

Study Findings

This section briefly summarizes the study findings related to each of the seven themes identified by the study team. The full report presents the statistical and narrative tables as well as discusses the findings in more depth.

Variation in Local Implementation

Information was gathered on the percentage of handicapped students served, the classifications and placements of handicapped students, the provision of related services, and special education program funding.

Special education enrollments ranged from 6.5 percent to 17.5 percent with a mean of 9.1 percent. Percentages were calculated based on public school enrollments only. In comparison to the national estimate of 11.0 percent, Council member districts served somewhat fewer numbers of handicapped students.

The largest categories of special education students were specific learning disabled (3.7 percent), speech impaired (1.4 percent), and mentally retarded (1.3 percent). Fewer students were found to be emotionally handicapped (0.9 percent), other health impaired (0.5 percent), orthopedically handicapped (0.2 percent), multi-handicapped (0.1 percent), and hard of hearing, visually handicapped, deaf, and deaf/blind (less than 0.1 percent). Great variation across the districts existed in the handicapping conditions of speech impaired, specific learning disabled, mentally retarded, and emotionally handicapped.

Regarding related services, over 20 percent of handicapped students received speech therapy, transportation, or psychological services. Less than 10 percent received social work, adaptive physical education, occupational therapy, physical therapy, or audiology services.

In order to examine funding levels, the percentage of district students enrolled in special education programs was compared to the percentage of the district budget allocated to special education. Approximately 60 percent of the districts spent a greater proportion on special education programs than expected by the percentage of students enrolled. Breakdowns of special education budgets showed that the largest shares came from state (46.4 percent) and local (45.7 percent) contributions. Federal dollars contributed only 7.9 percent. There was considerable variation in funding from all three sources.

Magnitude of Referral, Evaluation, and Placement Process

There is much speculation that special education referrals and placements are growing significantly. In this study, 36 percent reported increases in referrals, 32 percent reported no change, and 32 percent indicated a decrease. In terms of placements, 42 percent noted an increase, 42 percent no change, and 16 percent a decrease.

Referrals averaged approximately 3.4 percent of district enrollments, but they ranged from 0.6 percent to 11.0 percent. Actual placements averaged 1.9 percent of district enrollments, ranging from 0.7 percent to 4.1 percent. Slightly over half of the students referred to special education were actually placed in special education programs. All districts who reported high placement rates (greater than 75 percent) uniformly reported required pre-referral activities that helped to lower the number of inappropriate referrals.

Exit from Special Education Programs

Less than one-fifth of handicapped students leave special education programs. Categories of exit included "returned to general educational

program" (4.8 percent); "moved out of district" (4.0 percent); "graduated from high school" (3.8 percent); "withdrew from school" (2.8 percent); "entered private or parochial school" (1.3 percent); and "were no longer school age" (0.4 percent). When students leave, most districts provide informal monitoring or consultation.

Participation in Vocational Education Programs

Districts reported that approximately 11 percent of their handicapped students were enrolled in vocational education programs in comparison to 18 percent of their non-handicapped students. In only one-fourth of the districts did the percentage of handicapped students match or exceed the percentage of non-handicapped students. Other data showed that all but one district provided some special training, (e.g., coursework, inservice/ workshops) to staff who worked with handicapped students. Vocational education staff in most districts were expected to assist in the development of IEPs for handicapped students.

Involvement in District Decision-Making

In over half of the districts, special education was located within one or two management levels of the superintendent. In the remaining districts, special education ranged from three to five levels from the superintendent. When asked to rate the level of joint planning that occurs between regular and special education, 7 percent reported high levels of joint planning, 68 percent reported moderate levels, 18 percent varied levels, and 7 percent minimal or none. However, slightly over half noted that special education classrooms in regular education buildings were a source of difficulty because of limited space and the relatively low number of students assigned to special education.

Impact Data to Evaluate Special Education Programs

Evaluation of special education programs is of increasing interest. Two-thirds of the districts reported that they conduct evaluations of discrete program components that generally focus on program activities and procedures and not on student outcomes. Forty-two percent reported evaluations to monitor compliance with state and/or federal regulations. Only 29 percent reported that evaluations were conducted to determine program effectiveness or success based primarily on student outcomes. When asked what evaluation needs exist, districts focused on either additional studies to evaluate program component effectiveness (33 percent) or to assess student outcomes (56 percent).

Recommendations for Special Education Policy Makers

Districts were asked to generate recommendations for state and federal policy makers. Not unexpectedly, three-fourths of the districts focused on increasing funds to match program mandates. Almost 60 percent focused their recommendations on modifications broadly related to P.L. 94-142, including revisions of handicapped classifications; modifications in the referral, evaluation, and placement process; increase in flexibility for program spending; reduction in restrictiveness of regulations overall; and exploration of options for integrating regular and special education. These recommendations strongly reflect the districts' position that they must have more flexibility to meet the needs of handicapped students.

Conclusions and Recommendations

The results of this study identified a variety of critical issues confronting Council members in the delivery, management, and evaluation of special education programs. These issues and recommendations for future studies are briefly presented below.

Comparison of Special Education Programs Across Districts

There are widespread differences in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 by Council members. Significant differences were reported among districts in the percentage and classifications of handicapped students, the provision of related services, and special education funding. Variations in local districts' implementation of P.L. 94-142 should not be interpreted as a cause for concern or a call for greater definition of the regulations, but they do complicate the examination of special education programs across districts. Indeed, this study was precipitated in part by Council members' interest in developing a broad picture of the status of special education in their districts. Instead, the results of this study argue that such comparisons be made with great caution.

Impact of the Referral, Evaluation, and Placement Process on District Resources

The referral, evaluation, and placement of students in special education programs represents a significant demand on special education resources. Effective use of resources dictates that the percentage of students referred and placed should be very high. However, Council members averaged only 55 percent. As a result, special education programs are expending significant proportions of staff time for inappropriate referrals. Districts have attempted to attack this problem by initiating required pre-referral activities. All of the districts with high placement rates also reported pre-referral activities that helped to lower the number of inappropriate referrals. But more attention to the referral, evaluation, and placement process is still needed, especially if referrals continue to grow and resources remain level.

Use of the Specific Learning Disabled Classification

The largest number of handicapped students were in the specific learning disabled category. Although the national estimates are approximately 4.6 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 1984) 40 percent of the districts reported higher percentages. Since there does not appear to be any reason to suspect the validity of national estimates or their applicability to large city school districts, it seems likely that large city school districts are overusing the specific learning disabled classification.

Referral of At-Risk Students to Special Education

School districts are faced with increasing numbers of "at-risk" students whose needs are not met satisfactorily by regular education programs. Special education directors serving on the study's steering committee strongly believed that more and more of these at-risk students are being referred to special education, especially in light of the increase in referrals and the suspected overuse of the specific learning disabled category. Special education instructional strategies that rely on low student-teacher ratios and individualized programs may be appropriate for these at-risk students but should be used in regular education classrooms. It is not necessary to misclassify and transfer these students to special education programs.

Enrollment of Handicapped Students in Vocational Education Programs

Vocational education program participation of handicapped students is generally far below that of non-handicapped students. Although there are some districts in which the reverse is true, three-fourths of the districts reported lower percentages. Given the legal mandates for equal access and

participation, it seems clear that a sizeable number of the districts must begin to address this issue.

Evaluation of Student Outcomes

When asked what evaluation needs existed, over half of the districts reported that they needed information about the successfulness of their programs in terms of student outcomes on both an annual and long-term basis. They also are interested in determining the comparative success of different treatments for particular handicapped populations. Addressing these evaluation needs is not simply a matter of reordering evaluation resources to meet priorities. As some districts noted, appropriate evaluation criteria are difficult to establish for many special education programs or handicapped student groups and as a result, evaluation of these programs is not an easy undertaking. Districts must begin to attack this issue, especially given the increasing demands on special education programs and district budgets.

Recommendations for Future Work

In order to gain a more complete understanding on the status of special education, additional Council investigation is needed in the following three areas.

1. Development of longitudinal descriptive data base on special education programs. Collection of the data for this study represents an ambitious undertaking by Council members, but it really is only the first step. Many of the critical issues facing special education involve changes over time and so longitudinal data are necessary. In addition, a number of questions (or issues) emerged during the course of the study, such as the referral of at-risk students to special education programs. Since these questions were not in the original survey, it was difficult to respond to

these issues directly. By continuing to collect information and expand the data base, Council members can begin to address these issues.

2. Integration of regular and special education programs. Over half of the recommendations identified by Council member districts focused on reducing the restrictiveness of P.L. 94-142 in meeting students' educational needs. Districts' concerns stemmed from their suspicions concerning a number of factors, including an increase in the number of special education referrals, the overuse of the specific learning disabled classification, the referral of at-risk students to special education programs, and the commonality of instructional approaches for mildly handicapped, disadvantaged, and low performing students. At the heart of these issues is the inappropriate referral of low achieving students to special education. Many of the Council member districts believe that these issues must be addressed by regular and special education together. One possible approach which merits further attention is the integration of regular education programs for low performing students with special education programs for mildly handicapped students. The Council should support further study and discussion around this option.

3. Identification and dissemination of successful practices. The second phase of this study includes the identification of successful programs and practices of Council members. Many districts have submitted materials on innovative and successful ways to deal with some of the problems facing special education. These programs and practices should be explored for applicability to all Council members.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
	ABSTRACT	iii
	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	v
	LIST OF TABLES	xvi
I.	INTRODUCTION	1
II.	METHODOLOGY	4
	A. Sample	5
	B. Survey Instrument	5
	C. Data Collection	6
	D. Data Analysis	8
III.	STUDY FINDINGS	9
	A. Variation in Local Implementation	9
	B. Magnitude of Referral, Evaluation. and Placement Process	25
	C. Exit from Special Education Programs	32
	D. Participation in Vocational Education Programs	36
	E. Involvement in District Decision-Making	40
	F. Impact Data to Evaluate Special Education Programs	44
	G. Recommendations for Special Education Policy Makers	46
IV.	CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS	49
	A. Critical Issues	49
	B. Recommendations for Future Work	55
	REFERENCES	57
APPENDIX:	Special Education Survey	58

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
1.	Percent of District Students by Handicap	11
2.	Number of District Students by Handicap	14
3.	Special Education Enrollments in Various Placements	18
4.	Classroom Buildings	19
5.	Number of Handicapped Students Receiving Related Services	21
6.	Overall District and Special Education Budgets	22
7.	Federal, State, and Local Contributions to District Special Education Handicapped Budgets	24
8.	Number of Students Referred and Placed in Special Education Programs	26
9.	Number of New Referrals Indexed to Current Special Education Enrollments	27
10.	Required and Optional Participants in Initial IEP Meetings	29
11.	Role of Special Education for Students Referred but Not Placed	30
12.	Required and Optional Pre-Referral Special Education Activities	31
13.	Reasons for Students Leaving Special Education Programs	33
14.	Type of Follow-Up Support Provided to Students Leaving Special Education Programs	35
15.	Non-Handicapped Versus Handicapped Student Enrollment in Vocational Education Programs	37
16.	Type of Training Provided to Vocational Education Staff Who Teach Handicapped Students	38
17.	Vocational Education Staff Involvement in IEP Process	39
18.	Location of Special Education In School District Organization	41
19.	Degree of District-Level Joint Planning Concerning Special Education Students	42
20.	Degree of Special Education Impact on School Space and Facility Utilization	43
21.	Current and Needed Special Education Evaluations	45
22.	Special Education Recommendations for State and Federal Policy Makers	47

I. INTRODUCTION

Urban school districts have become increasingly concerned about the mission, roles, and effectiveness of special education programs. Special education changed radically in the mid-1970s with the passage of P.L. 94-142, other federal and state legislation, and related court decisions. In response, school districts focused their attention on identifying handicapped students, diagnosing their handicaps, and placing them in special education programs. As school districts began to succeed with these tasks, their focus expanded to include post-placement, programmatic activities. That is, what instruction, class size, curricula, and intervention might best remediate or minimize the handicapping condition. A more recent interest has been pre-placement activities to screen out inappropriate referrals to the evaluation and placement process, or even to prevent the need for special education placement.

As special education programs have begun to stabilize, a number of important questions have emerged concerning the appropriateness of special education referrals, the effectiveness of special education services, the cost of these programs, and the data school districts gather about special education students and their needs. These questions are asked with the following trends in mind.

- Special education is continuing to grow.
- Special education is a place for all hard-to-teach students.
- Special education is preoccupied with the find/diagnose/place task.
- Special education programs do not have systematic data to support the effectiveness of their programs in increasing the achievement or improving the behavior of the placed child.

- Few students are leaving special education programs and returning to regular classrooms.

- Increasing graduation requirements, competency tests, and expectations for student achievement may increase the numbers of students assigned to special education.

- Special education often is isolated from regular education with respect to school resources management, program planning, teacher training, and classroom instruction.

- An imbalance of resources and expertise is developing between regular and special education classrooms.

These trends are reinforced by a feeling on the part of school officials that "special" education programs cannot be managed in the same way as the "regular" curriculum programs. Although special education represents a significant amount of the budget in each school district, these same districts do not feel in control of special education--in fact, they more often feel controlled by it. Special education is often described in terms of the court decisions, regulatory rules, and feelings of intimidation, rather than the quality of programs and services being provided to special needs students.

In 1985, the Board of Directors of the Council of the Great City Schools authorized an examination of this sensitive area. In response, Council directors of special education and research have designed a three-phase study that:

- collects and analyzes descriptive information on the special education operations of member districts (Phase I)

- based on Phase I results, investigates member-nominated effective special education practices in-depth, documents the most useful among them, and disseminates detailed descriptions to Council members and other districts (Phase II)

- assesses the efficacy of special education programs for special needs students (Phase III).

This document reports on the first phase of the study. It describes the design of the study and procedures used to collect data from Council members (Chapter II), the findings of the study (Chapter III), and conclusions and recommendations for future study (Chapter IV).

Council members have begun work on Phase II of the study. Districts have submitted promising programs and practices for consideration. Brief descriptions of these submissions have been prepared. However, there has not yet been a formal review or documentation of the effectiveness of these programs and practices. Completion of Phase II and all of Phase III remain important next steps requiring the Council's direction and commitment.

II. METHODOLOGY

Phase I of the special education study began in the spring of 1985 with a meeting in Philadelphia of Council special education and research directors to discuss the study concept and focus. The meeting produced an agreement to proceed with the study and an outline to guide further planning.

During the summer, the following specific study questions were formulated based on Council member input.

- How are special education programs organized, developed, and managed?
- What do the services cost?
- What are the characteristics of students classified for special education?
- How do students get placed in special education programs?
- What are the staffing and facility patterns?
- What services do these students receive?
- What impact do these services have?
- How are special education students involved in vocational programs and compensatory programs?
- What are the high priority special education issues facing local school districts?
- What are the most promising programs and practices presently in use?
- What recommendations should be made to state and federal policy makers with regard to special education?

These questions provided the framework for the design of the study, the survey instrument, the data analysis plan, and interpretation of results. The remainder of this section briefly describes the study sample, survey instrument, data collection, and data analysis.

A. Sample

The special education directors of all 35 members of the Council of the Great City Schools (membership as of December, 1985) were sent a survey and cover letter inviting them to par- ticipate in the study. Thirty-three districts (94.3 percent) participated by returning the initial survey. These districts are listed alphabetically below. The student populations ranged in size from 30,346 (St. Paul) to 932,880 (New York City) with a median of 63,346 (Nashville).

Participating Council School Districts

Albuquerque	Detroit	Philadelphia
Atlanta	Indianapolis	Pittsburgh
Baltimore	Long Beach	Portland
Boston	Los Angeles	Rochester
Buffalo	Memphis	St. Louis
Chicago	Milwaukee	St. Paul
Cleveland	Minneapolis	San Francisco
Columbus	Nashville	Seattle
Dade County	New Orleans	Toledo
Dallas	New York City	Tulsa
Denver	Omaha	Washington, D.C.

B. Survey Instrument

An initial draft of the survey was developed by the Council study directors and RBS staff to collect information relevant to the 11 study questions identified above. The initial draft contained specific questions within 17 information categories included in the study. These categories of questions were discussed with Council special education and research directors at their meeting in Pittsburgh in September 1985. By a voting procedure based on perceived priority, the group eliminated nine of the 17 categories. The remaining eight were students; staff and facilities; fiscal and budget; pre-referral, referral, placement, and exit; program evaluation;

vocational education; related services; and remedial and compensatory programs.

In October, more specific survey question specifications were developed in the remaining categories and sent to all Council special education and research directors for review. The questions asked for information to be submitted via copies of existing reports and materials (e.g., P.L. 94-142 report to the SEA) and original information (e.g., number of referrals). Many questions requested statistical information, while others were open-ended requests for narrative information about procedures, results, or recommendations. Approximately half of the Council districts responded with suggestions for modifying the draft questions.

During December 1985, RBS staff field tested a draft survey form with special education and research staff in Philadelphia. Final revisions were made following the field test. The final form collected information on all of the above eight categories using existing and new information in statistical and narrative formats. A copy of the final survey is included in the Appendix.

C. Data Collection

The survey was sent to all 35 Council members in January, 1986 with a requested return date of February 21, 1986. As noted above, thirty-three cities eventually returned completed surveys to RBS.[1] Survey responses were reviewed by RBS to ensure their accuracy and completeness. In many cases,

[1] In addition, 24 districts submitted close to 100 self-identified programs and practices in special education instruction, management, and evaluation. These programs and practices will be presented in a companion document.

RBS contacted school districts to check and confirm responses in order to produce a relatively clean data base.

Once the survey responses were verified, the information was organized into tabular listings for each survey question. These listings presented data for each question by individual district. For example, one listing reported number of students by handicapping classifications by district. Narrative responses to survey questions were simply transcribed verbatim. This process resulted in 19 statistical and 23 narrative listings.

Both the statistical and narrative listings were shared with the Council study directors and a group of 12 special education directors in mid-June of 1986. This group reviewed and reduced the number and focus of the statistical and narrative listings. Reductions occurred when large numbers of the districts were unable to produce information (e.g., special education student involvement in remedial and compensatory education programs) or information reported by districts was judged unreliable or inconsistent across districts (e.g., staffing patterns). Although some revisions were made in the range of information collected on a particular category, only two were completely eliminated--special education staffing patterns and remedial and compensatory education.

Based on the feedback of the special education directors, a total of 11 statistical and 15 narrative listings were returned to allow the 33 participating districts to verify the accuracy of the revised data base and to update and focus their responses to the narrative items. These materials were sent to districts in mid-July with an expected one month turnaround.

Updated responses were returned by 21 of the 33 districts (64 percent). An additional seven districts were contacted by telephone by RBS to clarify

and update information. The original survey responses were used for the five districts that elected not to return the updated survey items or to respond to telephone inquiries.

D. Data Analysis

The condensed statistical and narrative listings served as the data base for all of the data analyses. Simple descriptive statistics (e.g., means, medians, standard deviations, ranges) were calculated for the quantitative data listings. Categories were developed for coding each district's narrative responses. Frequency counts and percentages were calculated for the coded narrative responses.

These analyses were reviewed by the study directors and a subgroup of six of the special education directors that reviewed the statistical and narrative listings in June. During this second meeting, the group again reviewed the accuracy and completeness of the data sets and identified underlying themes or issues supported by the data and their implications for special education overall and future research efforts. These themes were used to organize the study findings.

III. STUDY FINDINGS

This study gathered a wealth of information on special education organization and management, characteristics of handicapped student populations, services provided to handicapped students, and critical problems facing special education in large city school districts across this country. All data represented circumstances during the 1984-85 school year. Rather than present the information question by question, as it was collected and analyzed, seven underlying themes have been identified to focus and structure the presentation of data. These themes are listed below:

- variations in local implementation of P.L. 94-142
- magnitude of the referral, evaluation, and placement process
- limited number of handicapped students leaving special education programs
- limited participation of handicapped students in vocational education programs
- involvement of special education in district decision-making
- lack of impact data to evaluate special education programs
- recommendations for special education policy makers.

All of these themes reflect important issues confronting and affecting special education programs today.

The remaining sections of this chapter present the study findings related to each of the seven themes. Each section presents relevant statistical and narrative findings which define and explain the issue at hand.

A. Variations in Local Implementation

Passage of P.L. 94-142 assured that all handicapped children would have access to free and appropriate public education. Since all public school

districts are subject to P.L. 94-142, one might assume that the impact of this legislation on special education programs would be fairly similar across districts. To test this hypothesis, information was gathered from the 33 districts on the percentage of handicapped students served, the classifications and placements of handicapped children, the provision of related services, and the funding of special education programs. These variables provide a basis for comparing the impact of P.L. 94-142 on district special education programs.

1. Handicapped Student Enrollment

The percentage of students enrolled in special education programs by district is reported in Table 1. As indicated in the table, the total enrollment variation among the cities ranged from a low of 6.5 percent to a high of 17.5 percent. Half of the districts reported special education enrollments above the national estimates (U.S. Department of Education, 1984) while the other half reported enrollments below. However, these numbers should be interpreted with caution for several reasons. Enrollment percentages are based on public school enrollments and not public and non-public combined. A significant number of districts were unable to provide non-public enrollments, so it was decided to index the percentage by public enrollments only. Second, enrollments are reported for the entire age range served by the district. In approximately two-thirds of the districts, the mandated age range does not match the national estimate age range of 3-21. Third, some districts, for example Boston, have large private and parochial populations; however, the public schools provide special education for all students and may therefore have "disproportionately" high special education enrollment. Finally, in some districts, the city and intermediate unit may

Table 1

Percent of District Students by Handicap*

District	Mandated Ages Served	Total	Mentally Retarded	Hard of Hearing	Deaf	Speech Impaired	Visually Handicapped	Emotionally Handicapped	Orthopedically Impaired	Other Health Impaired	Specific Learning Disabled	Deaf/Blind	Multi-Handicapped	Other
Albuquerque	6-21	12.1	0.4	0.1	0	0	<0.1	0	0.2	0	4.8	<0.1	0.3	6.2[a]
Atlanta	5-21	6.7	1.6	<0.1	0	1.3	<0.1	0.8	<0.1	<0.1	1.6	0	1.2	0
Baltimore	0-21	16.9	1.3	0.1	<0.1	4.8	0.1	0.7	0.1	0.1	9.2	<0.1	0.6	0
Buffalo	4.9-21	17.5	2.9	0.1	<0.1	5.8	0.1	2.5	0.1	<0.1	6.1	0	0.1	0
Chicago	3-21	10.5	2.7	0.2	0.1	1.8	0.1	1.4	0.4	0.1	3.4	<0.1	b	0.4
Columbus	5-21	10.0	2.9	0.2	0	1.5	0.1	1.0	0.4	0	0	0	0.1	3.9[c]
Dade County	0-21	9.6	0.9	<0.1	0.1	1.8	<0.1	0.5	0.2	0.1	4.4	0	0.1	1.3
Dallas	0-21	7.2	0.9	0.1	0	1.6	<0.1	0.4	0.1	0.2	3.4	<0.1	0.5	<0.1
Denver	5-21	8.3	1.5	0.1	b	1.0	0.1	1.3	0.1	b	4.1	b	b	<0.1
Detroit	0-26	8.8	2.9	0.3	<0.1	2.0	0.1	0.7	0.3	d	2.4	0	<0.1	0
DC	3-21	8.4	1.6	0.1	<0.1	2.0	<0.1	0.8	0.1	0.1	3.5	<0.1	0.1	0
Long Beach	3-21	6.5	0.5	<0.1	<0.1	1.8	0.1	0.1	0.3	0.2	3.5	0	0.1	0
Los Angeles	3-21	8.3	0.8	0.2	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.4	0.3	1.0	3.8	<0.1	0.1	0
Memphis	4-21	11.6	2.9	0.2	0	2.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	0.8	4.0	<0.1	0.3	0.6
Milwaukee	3-21	9.2	1.6	0.1	0.1	2.4	0.1	1.5	0.2	0.1	3.1	<0.1	0.1	0
Minneapolis	4-21	13.0	2.6	0.2	0	2.4	0.1	2.4	0.4	0.2	4.5	0	0	0.1
Nashville	4-21	11.3	1.8	0.2	0	3.0	0.1	0.6	0.1	0.1	4.7	0	0.3	0.4
New Orleans	NA	8.9	1.7	0.1	<0.1	3.0	0.1	1.4	0.1	0.2	2.2	<0.1	0.1	0
New York City	4.9-21	11.5	0.9	0.1	0.1	0.4	0.1	1.7	0.1	1.8	6.1	<0.1	0.2	<0.1
Omaha	0-21	13.4	2.9	0.3	0	2.6	0.1	2.3	0.8	0	4.4	0	0	0
Philadelphia	4.7-21	12.6	2.5	0.1	<0.1	2.4	0.1	1.2	0.2	0	6.0	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	4.7-21	15.3	2.7	0.3	<0.1	6.6	0.3	1.3	0.3	0	3.8	0	0	0
Portland	3-21	10.6	0.6	0.2	b	2.6[e]	0.1	1.0	0.2	0.2	5.1	<0.1	-	0.5
Rochester	4.9-21	14.5	2.7	0.1	0.2	2.8	<0.1	2.5	0.2	<0.1	5.8	0	0.2	<0.1
St. Louis	5-21	13.2	4.4	0.1	0.1	2.7	<0.1	0	0.2	0.2	4.0	0	0	1.6[f]
St. Paul	4-21	16.1	3.5	0.3	0	3.0	0.1	2.6	0.4	<0.1	6.1	0	0	0.1
San Francisco	3-21	10.2	0.9	<0.1	0.1	1.5	<0.1	0.7	0.2	0.1	6.3	<0.1	0.3	0
Seattle	3-21	10.3	1.2	0.1	0.1	1.5	<0.1	0.7	0.1	0.2	5.6	<0.1	0.1	0.6[g]
Toledo	3-21	11.1	0	0.3	0	3.0	0.1	0	0.4	d	2.1	0	0.3	4.9[h]
Tulsa	0-21	12.7	2.5	0.1	0.1	2.6	<0.1	0.2	0.1	<0.1	6.9	0	0.3	0
Mean		9.1	1.3	0.1	<0.1	1.5	0.1	0.9	0.2	0.5	3.7	<0.1	0.1	0.3
National Estimate[i]	3-21	11.0	1.9	0.2[j]	j	2.9	0.1	0.9	0.1	0.1	4.6	<0.1	0.2	-

*Footnotes appear on the following page.

Footnotes

Percent of District Students by Handicap

a = Includes behaviorally and communication disordered.

b = Included in other categories.

c = Includes behaviorally and developmentally handicapped.

d = Included in "orthopedically impaired."

e = Includes some hearing impaired.

f = Includes behavior disorders.

g = Includes pre-school handicapped.

h = Includes developmentally and severe behavior handicapped.

i = Estimates from U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services.

j = Includes hard of hearing and deaf.

not be contiguous; some district special education enrollments may be counted as part of the intermediate unit and not the city. Comparisons among districts or with the national estimate should be made with these four factors in mind. Table 2 provides the actual numbers of students upon which these overall percentages are based.

2. Classifications of Handicapped Children

Responding districts were asked to report the number of students by handicapping classification. In most cases, these numbers were obtained from P.L. 94-142 reports submitted by districts to their respective states during the 1984-85 school year. Tables 1 and 2, respectively, presented the incidence, percent, and number of each handicap classification for the overall district enrollments.

The greatest number of special education students were found in the categories of specific learning disabled (3.7 percent), speech impaired (1.5 percent), and mentally retarded (1.3 percent). Less than 1 percent of district enrollments were found to be emotionally handicapped (0.9 percent), other health impaired (0.5 percent), orthopedically handicapped (0.2 percent), hard of hearing (0.1 percent), visually handicapped (0.1 percent), multi-handicapped (0.1 percent), deaf (less than 0.1 percent), and deaf/blind (less than 0.1 percent).

Table 1 also listed the 1983-84 national estimates of handicapped students (ages 3-21) served in special education. Council districts served somewhat fewer handicapped students in the categories of mentally retarded, hard of hearing, speech impaired, specific learning disabled, and multi-handicapped. Larger numbers were served in only two areas, orthopedically handicapped and other health impaired.

Table 2

Number of District Students by Handicap*

District	Mandated Ages Served	Total Special Education Enrollment	Mentally Retarded	Hard of Hearing	Deaf	Speech Impaired	Visually Handicapped	Emotionally Handicapped	Orthopedically Impaired	Other Health Impaired	Specific Learning Disabled	Deaf/Blind	Multi-Handicapped	Other
Albuquerque	6-21	9,330	329	100	0	0	26	0	148	0	3,701	6	269	4,751[a]
Atlanta	5-21	4,454	1,049	4	0	862	28	551	32	20	1,077	0	831	0
Baltimore	0-21	18,918	1,510	96	40	5,360	125	735	62	87	10,282	2	619	0
Buffalo	4.9-21	8,161	1,329	33	15	2,683	27	1,143	40	10	2,833	0	48	0
Chicago	3-21	45,054	11,442	683	476	7,527	449	6,026	1,675	261	14,707	17	b	1,791[c]
Columbus	5-21	6,789	1,954	142	0	1,026	71	655	283	0	0	0	49	2,609
Dade County	0-21	21,803	2,132	80	200	4,000	113	1,115	550	250	10,131	0	250	2,982
Dallas	0-21	9,364	1,152	85	0	2,074	54	498	90	277	4,401	13	698	22
Denver	5-21	4,811	857	82	b	593	43	763	75	b	2,389	b	b	9
Detroit	0-26	16,616	5,567	490	21	3,851	256	1,276	612	d	4,490	0	53	0
DC	3-21	7,392	1,374	66	1	1,786	32	741	74	91	3,106	35	86	0
Long Beach	3-21	4,051	281	28	29	1,110	36	40	202	99	2,190	0	36	0
Los Angeles	3-21	46,492	4,712	1,080	666	8,103	444	2,136	1,623	5,751	21,266	14	697	0
Memphis	4-21	12,144	3,035	182	0	2,209	108	391	149	884	4,210	10	298	668
Milwaukee	3-21	8,509	1,451	94	40	2,245	37	1,430	178	66	2,870	5	93	0
Minneapolis	4-21	4,859	980	86	0	901	46	909	164	77	1,672	0	0	24
Nashville	4-21	7,189	1,121	152	0	1,892	66	395	94	49	2,997	0	162	261
New Orleans	NA	7,252	1,365	105	34	2,466	54	1,118	97	149	1,772	2	90	0
New York City	4.9-21	107,527	8,010	982	470	3,908	649	16,074	607	17,197	57,154	13	2,089	374
Omaha	0-21	5,540	1,228	120	0	1,085	47	960	316	0	1,834	0	0	0
Philadelphia	4.7-21	24,989	4,888	286	59	4,828	194	2,414	389	0	11,931	0	0	0
Pittsburgh	4.7-21	6,147	1,101	104	1	2,664	103	531	111	0	1,532	0	0	0
Portland	3-21	6,431	320	127	b	1,338[e]	40	509	126	82	2,593	11	f	260
Rochester	4.9-21	4,746	881	29	62	919	11	835	70	1	1,902	0	54	2
St. Louis	5-21	6,745	2,227	42	14	1,368	23	0	102	77	2,054	0	0	838[f]
St. Paul	4-21	4,994	1,073	108	0	933	40	799	122	15	1,885	0	0	19
San Francisco	3-21	5,406	579	18	70	944	21	442	124	45	3,969	1	218	0
Seattle	3-21	4,277	517	27	32	634	18	101	47	82	2,303	1	57	258[g]
Toledo	3-21	4,751	0	126	0	1,277	50	0	176	d	903	0	113	2,106[h]
Tulsa	0-21	5,684	1,099	30	45	1,179	13	88	25	6	3,077	0	122	0
Mean		14,350	2,119	186	76	2,236	107	1,429	279	853	6,174	4	231	566

*Footnotes appear on the following page.

Footnotes

Number of District Students by Handicap

a = Includes behaviorally and communication disordered.

b = Included in other categories.

c = Includes behaviorally and developmentally handicapped.

d = Included in "orthopedically impaired."

e = Includes some hearing impaired.

f = Includes behavior disorders.

g = Includes pre-school handicapped.

h = Includes developmentally and severe behavior handicapped.

There was great variance in the incidence of four of the 11 handicapping classifications: specific learning disabled (1.6 to 9.2 percent)[2], speech impaired (0.4 to 6.6 percent)[3], mentally retarded (0.4 to 4.4 percent), and emotionally handicapped (0.1 to 2.6 percent)[4]. These data suggest that clear diagnostic and placement procedures do not exist for these four handicapping classifications.

In marked contrast, there was little variation in the incidence of five other classifications: hard of hearing (0 to 1 percent), deaf (0 to 0.3 percent), visually handicapped (less than 0.1 to 0.2 percent), orthopedically handicapped (less than 0.1 to 0.4 percent), and deaf/blind (0 to less than 0.1 percent). These five categories are more closely tied to sensory or physical disabilities and diagnostic and placement procedures are less ambiguous.

3. Placements of Handicapped Students

One of the provisions of P.L. 94-142 is that handicapped students must be educated in the least restrictive environment possible. In most cases, the goal is to mainstream handicapped students into regular education classrooms for the greatest period of time possible. In order to examine special education placements across the districts, data were collected on numbers of district and non-district placements as well as the number of district buildings reserved for special education classrooms only.

---

[2]Columbus reports specific learning disabled in the Other category.

[3]Albuquerque reports speech impaired students in the Other category.

[4]Albuquerque, St. Louis, and Toledo report emotionally handicapped in the Other category.

Table 3 presents a breakdown of district and non-district placements. Over 90 percent of special education placements were in district facilities. Most districts placed significantly fewer of their handicapped students in other public agency-operated programs (1.1 percent), private day programs (3.4 percent), residential programs (1.0 percent), or homebound instruction (1.3 percent). However, most districts noted that their use of non-district placements was affected greatly by funding regulations. In some districts, reimbursement policies by the state are especially liberal for non-district placements and it is in the district's interest to place students in non-district facilities. In other districts, the reimbursement policy is not influenced by the placement and districts have decreased their number of contracted service placements. Special education directors generally expect the percentage of district versus non-district placements to change as funding formulas undergo revisions at the state level.

The number of district school buildings reserved solely for special education programs also was collected. As indicated in Table 4, four of the 33 districts (12.1 percent) located all of their special education classrooms in school buildings with regular education programs. One third reported only one or two school buildings as housing only special education programs and another third reported between three and five buildings. The remaining seven indicated that they used six or more buildings only for special education. Although the trend among large city school districts is to distribute special education classrooms throughout district buildings, there is some variation from district to district in the interpretation of "least restrictive environment" as evidenced by the variation in use of special education-only school buildings (0 to 7.7 percent).

Table 3. Special Education Enrollments in Various Placements

District	Mandated Ages Served	Total District Enrollment	Special Education Enrollments											
			District Facilities		Other Public Agency-Operated Programs		Private Day Placements		Residential Placements		Homebound Instruction		Total	
		N	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent	N	Percent
Albuquerque	6-21	77,222	9,330	12.1	0	0	110	0.1	0	0	122	0.2	9,562	12.4
Atlanta	5-21	66,570	4,528	6.8	126	0.2	0	0	23	<0.1	13	<0.1	4,690	7.0
Baltimore	0-21	112,000	18,222	16.3	0	0	617	0.6	38	<0.1	117	0.1	18,994	17.0
Boston	3-22	56,748	10,617	18.7	122	0.2	933	1.6	56	0.1	16	<0.1	11,744	20.7
Buffalo	4.9-22	46,619	8,468	18.2	457	1.0	341	0.7	116	0.2	3	<0.1	9,385	20.1
Chicago	3-21	428,038	45,054	10.5	43	<0.1	2,722	0.6	424	0.1	28	<0.1	48,271	11.3
Cleveland	3-21	74,171	5,724	7.7	150	0.2	0	0	0	0	150	0.2	6,024	8.1
Columbus	5-21	67,651	6,675	9.9	143	0.2	0	0	143	0.2	174	0.3	7,135	10.5
Dade County	3-21[a]	228,062	21,815	9.6	205	0.1	0	0	88	<0.1	1,400	0.6	23,508	10.3
Dallas	0-21	130,416	9,011	6.9	207	0.2	70	0.1	0	0	76	0.1	9,364	7.2
Denver	5-21	57,727	4,811	8.3	185	0.3	50	0.1	344	0.6	56	0.1	5,446	9.4
Detroit	0-26	189,651	16,616	8.8	160	0.1	0	0	13	<0.1	58	<0.1	16,847	8.9
DC	3-21	87,927	6,402	7.3	352	0.4	428	0.5	212	0.2	0	0	7,394	8.4
Indianapolis	NA	54,042	6,859	12.7	26	<0.1	10	<0.1	3	<0.1	46	0.1	6,944	12.8
Long Beach	3-21	61,940	4,051	6.5	44	0.1	16	<0.1	0	0	3	<0.1	4,114	6.6
Los Angeles	3-21	560,264	46,492	8.3	32	<0.1	1,203	0.2	210	<0.1	168	<0.1	48,105	8.6
Memphis	4-21	104,935	12,114	11.5	29	<0.1	233	0.2	17	<0.1	886	0.8	13,279	12.7
Milwaukee	3-21	92,533	8,987	9.7	0	0	15	<0.1	0	0	6	<0.1	9,008	9.7
Minneapolis	4-21	37,456	4,859	13.0	180	0.5	0	0	257	0.7	16	0.1	5,332	14.2
Nashville	4-21	63,346	5,839	9.2	0	0	143	0.2	13	<0.1	58	0.1	6,053	9.6
New Orleans	NA	81,393	9,270	11.4	106	0.1	57[b]	0.1	88	0.1	8	<0.1	9,529	11.7
New York City	4.9-21	932,880	105,803	11.3	0	0	7,016[b]	0.8	2,109	0.2	1,463	0.2	116,391	12.5
Omaha	0-21	41,632	5,600	13.5	33	0.1	325	0.8	25	0.1	75	0.2	6,058	14.6
Philadelphia	4.7-21	197,980	24,989	12.6	0	0	876	0.4	44	<0.1	501	0.3	26,410	13.3
Pittsburgh	4.7-21	40,257	5,956	14.8	0	0	308	0.8	6	<0.1	55	0.1	6,325	15.7
Portland	3-21	50,986	4,446	8.7	389	0.8	100	0.2	104	0.2	69	0.1	5,108	10.0
Rochester	4.9-21	32,830	4,686	14.3	12	<0.1	255	0.8	28	0.1	68	0.2	5,049	15.4
St. Louis	5-21	51,059	6,745	13.2	1,978	3.9	80	0.2	4	<0.1	31	0.1	8,838	17.3
St. Paul	4-21	30,972	4,715	15.2	0	0	0	0	180	0.6	1	<0.1	4,896	15.8
San Francisco	3-21	62,979	6,012	9.5	0	0	350	0.6	7	<0.1	62	0.1	6,431	10.2
Seattle	3-21	41,383	4,342	10.5	128	0.3	8	<0.1	34	0.1	0	0	4,512	10.9
Toledo	3-21	42,922	4,751	11.1	281	0.7	0	0	159	0.4	183	0.4	5,374	12.5
Tulsa	0-21	44,691	5,684	12.7	100	0.2	0	0	100	0.2	340	0.8	6,224	13.9
Mean		128,776	13,620	10.6	166	0.1	493	0.4	147	0.1	190	0.1	14,616	11.4

[a] Children who are visually impaired/hearing impaired are served from birth.
[b] Includes non-public schools.

Table 4

Classroom Buildings

District	Number of Buildings	Number of Special Education Buildings	Percent
Albuquerque	114	0	0
Atlanta	114	0	0
Baltimore	190	13	6.8
Boston	123	5	4.1
Buffalo	76	2	2.6
Chicago	597	12	2.0
Cleveland	129	2	1.6
Columbus	128	3	2.3
Dade County	250	2	0.8
Dallas	783	2	0.3
Denver	116	1	0.9
Detroit	292	15	5.1
DC	184	4	2.2
Indianapolis	83	2	2.4
Long Beach	80	3	3.8
Los Angeles	644	18	2.8
Memphis	159	4	2.5
Milwaukee	140	4	2.9
Minneapolis	52	4	7.7
Nashville	137	6	4.4
New Orleans	127	5	3.9
New York City	1,095	32	2.9
Omaha	75	1	1.3
Philadelphia	255	8	3.1
Pittsburgh	88	3	3.4
Portland	100	3	3.0
Rochester	50	0	0
St. Louis	119	2	1.7
St. Paul	74	2	2.7
San Francisco	121	2	1.7
Seattle	91	1	1.1
Toledo	66	0	0
Tulsa	92	5	5.4
Mean	204	5	2.5

4. Provision of Related Services

Data were gathered on the percentage of students receiving eight related services[5] frequently provided to handicapped students: speech therapy, occupational therapy, physical therapy, social work, psychological services, adaptive physical education, audiology services, and transportation. Table 5 summarizes the number and percentage of handicapped students receiving each service. Many districts had difficulty reporting these numbers because of decentralized recordkeeping. For those reporting data, the three most frequently provided related services were speech therapy (32.4 percent), transportation (27.1 percent), and psychological services (21.9 percent).[6] Significantly fewer numbers of students received social work (8.8 percent), adaptive physical education (8.6 percent), physical therapy (3.3 percent), occupational therapy (2.5 percent), and audiology services (1.8 percent). Within most of the categories, there was significant variation in the percentage of handicapped students receiving particular related services. However, because of issues related to definition and recordkeeping, it is difficult to estimate how much of the variation across districts is due to differences in the provision of related services versus other confounding factors.

5. Funding of Special Education Programs

District funding of special education programs was examined. Table 6 compares the percent of each district's students classified as handicapped

---

[5] Related services were defined as auxiliary or support services that supported the handicapped student's primary placement.

[6] The number of handicapped students receiving psychological services and social work may be confounded by districts including or excluding services related to the assessment/evaluation process.

Table 5. Number of Handicapped Students Receiving Related Services

District	Speech Therapy	Occupational Therapy	Physical Therapy	Social Work	Psychological Services	Adaptive PE	Audiology Services	Transportation	Total Special Education Enrollment
Albuquerque	3,427	487	198	NA	343	760	142	2,130	9,330
Atlanta	987	130	139	NA	673[a]	279	1,097	1,290[a]	4,454
Baltimore	7,531	537	290	257	56	91	680	3,782	18,918
Boston	2,355	282	259	750	1,100	673	NA	2,100	10,617
Buffalo	2,683	361	67	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	8,161
Chicago	18,500	524	1,220	15,885	15,885	5,710	1,031	15,304	45,054
Cleveland	4,050[c]	404	404	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	5,724
Columbus	2,007	280	280	0	103	328	142	1,596	6,789
Dade County	3,803	900	850	5,000	20,786	1,400	954	2,239	21,803
Dallas	4,800	443	150	3,121	9,364	468	293	3,120	9,364
Denver	1,526	277	218	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,811
Detroit	7,168	362	228	4,628	3,716	3,110	1,326	5,670	16,616
DC	1,786	204	125	1,469	1,074	NA	39	2,551	7,392
Indianapolis	669	174	170	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	6,859
Long Beach	1,958	200	b	c	5	506	57	1,067	4,051
Los Angeles	13,918	NA	NA	NA	2,201	8,897	912	10,433	46,492
Memphis	2,610	230	6,390	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	12,144
Milwaukee	2,042	277	353	340	893	NA	240	3,615	8,509
Minneapolis	619	214	b	4,859	293	310	38	NA	4,859
Nashville	1,760	133	177	NA	286	3	NA	1,400	7,189
New Orleans	3,126	523	273	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	7,252
New York City	34,534	1,413	1,286	c	34,323	14,000	358	39,145	107,527
Omaha	2,359	190	175	NA	2,235	NA	89	3,500	5,590
Philadelphia	8,087	450	386	NA	3,394	NA	286	14,200	24,989
Pittsburgh	503	NA	370	NA	NA	322	105	2,853	6,147
Portland	2,210	350	158	671	NA	439	74	1,229	5,406
Rochester	919	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,766
St. Louis	1,368	72	67	283	289	151	118	109	6,745
St. Paul	2,457	1,372	274	1,766	56	460	8	1,782	4,994
San Francisco	1,819	162	119	NA	NA	240	14	1,200	6,431
Seattle	1,860	275	175	NA	NA	NA	NA	NA	4,277
Mean	4,627	401	548	3,002	4,854	2,008	381	5,468	14,299
Percent	32.4	2.5	3.3	8.8	21.9	8.6	1.8	27.1	-

[a] Estimated.
[b] Included in occupational therapy.
[c] Included in psychological services.

Table 6

Overall District and Special Education Budgets

District	Mandated Ages Served	Special Ed Percent of District Enrollment	Total District Budget	Total Special Education Budget	Percent of Total District Budget
Albuquerque	6-21	12.1	$ 300,346,500	$ 31,551,353	10.5
Atlanta	5-21	6.7	194,751,142	14,643,250[a]	7.5
Baltimore City	0-21	16.9	331,357,043	49,672,000	15.0
Boston	3-22	18.7	236,438,000	49,100,000[a]	20.8
Buffalo[b]	4.9-21	17.5	160,892,503	11,390,137	7.1
Chicago[c]	3-21	10.5	1,800,000,000	250,000,000	13.9
Cleveland[c]	3-21	7.7	327,000,000	23,000,000[a]	7.0
Columbus	5-21	10.0	214,432,257	21,162,807	9.9
Dade County	3-21	9.6	938,493,461	60,225,669	6.4
Dallas	0-21	7.2	552,909,349	29,116,166	5.3
Denver	5-21	8.3	246,713,434	17,357,707	7.0
Detroit	0-26	8.8	734,467,988	50,983,305	6.9
DC	3-21	8.4	385,151,000	35,003,074	9.1
Indianapolis	NA	12.7	170,935,881	15,653,744	9.2
Long Beach	3-21	6.5	221,968,334	17,189,757	7.7
Los Angeles[d]	3-21	8.3	2,716,636,964	245,690,869	9.0
Memphis	4-21	11.6	233,880,318	15,700,218	6.7
Milwaukee	3-21	9.2	383,637,239	38,348,787[a]	10.0
Minneapolis[b]	4-21	13.0	131,491,078	17,152,540	13.0
Nashville	4-21	11.3	156,837,232	21,264,655	13.6
New York City	4.9-21	11.5	3,899,365,010	895,301,511	23.0
Omaha	0-21	13.4	123,302,191	10,400,001	8.4
Philadelphia[d]	4.7-21	12.6	934,082,900	122,024,798	13.1
Pittsburgh	4.7-21	15.3	228,990,000	32,556,200	14.2
Portland	3-21	10.6	251,785,294	22,511,840	8.9
Rochester	4.9-21	14.5	168,208,291	18,825,281	11.2
St. Louis[d]	5-21	13.2	238,650,445	19,747,123	8.3
St. Paul	4-21	16.1	130,900,868	17,680,698	13.5
San Francisco[c]	3-21	10.2	252,000,000	33,670,000	13.4
Seattle	3-21	10.3	172,370,742	12,266,815	7.1
Toledo	3-21	11.1	133,299,167	13,420,373	10.1
Tulsa	0-21	12.7	122,207,670	27,991,518	22.9
Mean		9.3	$569,702,711	$75,553,934	13.3

Note: All figures represent FY 1984 or FY 1985 and/or school year 1984-85 unless otherwise indicated.

a = Does not include federal funds; not included in mean or range.
b = 1983-84 school year figures.
c = Estimated.
d = 1985-86 figures.

to the percent of district budgets allocated to special education programs. The differences in percentages (enrollment versus budget) ranged from 10.4 percent to -11.5 percent. Eighteen of the 28 districts (64.3 percent) spent a greater percentage of their budget on special education programs than would be expected by the percentage of students enrolled (the differences in percentage ranged from 0.1 percent to 10.4 percent more, with a median of 2.3 percent). The percentages of special education enrollment versus budget matched exactly for one of the districts (3.6 percent). The remaining districts (9, or 32.1 percent) did not spend as much of their budgets on special education as their enrollment proportions might project (the differences in percentages ranged from 0.5 percent to 11.5 percent less, with a median of 2.3 percent). Clearly the funding of special education programs across large city districts varies significantly.

In order to explore this issue in more depth, information was gathered on federal, state, and local contributions to the special education budget. Due to differences in the flow through of federal funds and to accounting problems, only 19 of the 32 districts were able to provide these figures. Table 7 reports special education budget breakdowns by federal, state, and local contributions. Overall, the largest share of special education budgets come from state contributions (46.4 percent). Local contributions account for 45.7 percent and federal contributions for 7.9 percent. However, there is considerable variation within each of the three sources. The percent of federal contributions ranges from a low of 3.9 to a high of 12.2 percent. State and local contribution percentages vary much more. State percentages range from 0.1 to 90.6 percent and local percentages from 5.5 to 93.8 percent. As noted earlier, the critical factor in determining the

Table 7

Federal, State, and Local Contributions to
District Special Education Handicapped Budgets

District	Total Special Education Budget Dollars	Federal Contribution Dollars	%	State Contribution Dollars	%	Local Contribution Dollars	%
Baltimore	49,672,000	4,462,000	9.0	2,000,000	4.0	43,210,000	87.0
Chicago[a]	250,000,000	15,294,609	6.1	82,550,183	33.0	152,155,208	60.9
Columbus	21,162,807	1,278,130	6.0	15,907,741	75.2	3,976,936	18.8
Dade County	60,225,729	3,649,864	6.1	78,579	0.1	56,497,286	93.8
Dallas	29,116,166	1,752,456	6.0	15,565,428	53.5	11,798,282	40.5
Denver	16,940,707	1,157,758	6.8	8,147,294	48.1	7,635,655	45.1
DC	35,003,074	4,269,035	12.2	30,734,039	87.8	-	-
Long Beach	17,189,757	873,953	5.1	13,608,313	79.2	2,707,491	15.7
Los Angeles[b]	245,690,869	9,958,860	4.1	184,512,988	75.1	51,219,021	20.8
Minneapolis[c]	17,169,692[c]	1,046,305	6.1	10,394,439	60.5	5,728,948	33.4
Nashville	21,264,655	1,753,173	8.2	9,191,468	43.2	10,320,014	48.6
New York City	895,301,511	89,530,151	10.0	331,261,559	39.0	474,509,801	53.0
Philadelphia	121,214,526	6,974,000	5.8	99,434,099	82.0	14,806,427	12.2
Pittsburgh	32,556,200	1,282,200	3.9	23,135,232	71.1	8,138,768	26.0
Portland	22,511,840	2,651,233	11.8	4,630,910	20.6	15,229,697	67.6
St. Louis	19,747,123	1,329,403	6.7	7,759,941	39.3	10,657,779	54.0
St. Paul	17,680,698	1,440,887	8.2	11,809,676	66.8	4,430,135	25.0
San Francisco[a]	33,670,000	1,300,000	3.9	30,490,000	90.6	1,880,000	5.5
Toledo	13,420,373	895,090	6.7	10,530,427	78.5	1,994,856	14.8
Mean	101,028,992	7,942,058	7.9	46,933,806	46.4	46,152,437	45.7

Note: All figures represent FY 1984 or FY 1985 and/or school year 1984-85 unless otherwise indicated.

a = Estimated.
b = 1985-86 figures.
c = 1983-84 figures.

relative budget contributions is the state formula for funding special education programs.

B. Magnitude of Referral, Evaluation, and Placement Process

There is much speculation that referrals to and placements in special education programs are growing significantly. In this study, 10 of 28 districts (35.7 percent) reported increases in referrals, nine (32.1 percent) reported no change, and nine (32.1 percent) indicated a decrease. In terms of placements, 10 of 24 (41.6 percent) noted an increase, 10 (41.6 percent) no change, and 4 (16.7 percent) a decrease.

Table 8 reports the number of district students referred and placed in special education. Approximately 3.4 percent were referred to special education. Individual district percentages ranged from a low of 0.6 percent to a high of 11.0 percent. Actual placements averaged 1.9 percent, with individual districts reporting between less than 0.7 percent and 4.1 percent. Although these data do not support dramatic and uniform increases, they do support a steady increase in the number of handicapped students served by special education programs.

Two other analyses of the referral and placement data were conducted. First, the number of new referrals was compared to the number of already placed handicapped students. As presented in Table 9, districts were asked to evaluate a relatively large number of students each year, generally equalling 31.6 percent of the students they already served in special education. In eight of the districts (28.6 percent), the number of new referrals equalled 40 percent or more of the current special education enrollments in the districts. In these districts, special education referrals obviously impact heavily on the operations of the special education staff.

Table 8

Number of Students Referred and Placed
in Special Education Programs

District	District Enrollment	Number of Students Referred	Percent of District Enrollment	Number of Students Placed	Percent of District Enrollment	Percent of Referred Students Placed
Albuquerque	77,222	5,209	6.7	2,842	3.7	54.6
Baltimore	112,000	5,344	4.8	2,672	2.4	50.0
Boston	56,748	2,902	5.1	1,130	2.0	38.9
Buffalo	46,619	2,463	5.3	1,062	2.3	43.1
Chicago	428,038	13,000[a]	3.0	6,000	1.4	46.2
Cleveland	74,171	1,139	1.5	500	0.7	43.9
Columbus	67,651	1,501	2.2	566	0.8	37.7
Dade County	228,062	3,000[a]	1.3	1,576	0.7	52.5
Dallas	130,416	1,500[a]	1.2	1,200	0.9	80.0
Denver	57,727	4,086	7.1	2,306	4.0	56.4
DC	87,927	1,664	1.9	1,308	1.5	78.6
Indianapolis	54,042	1,508	2.8	710	1.3	47.1
Long Beach	61,940	1,200[a]	1.9	577	0.9	48.1
Los Angeles	560,264	23,721	4.2	10,050	1.8	42.4
Memphis	104,935	600	0.6	550	0.5	91.7
Milwaukee	92,533	3,841	4.2	2,420	2.6	63.0
New Orleans	81,393	4,356	5.4	3,030	3.7	69.6
New York City	932,880	33,855	3.6	22,413	2.4	66.2
Omaha	41,632	2,237	5.4	1,678	4.0	75.0
Philadelphia	197,980	3,394	1.7	2,568	1.3	75.7
Pittsburgh	40,257	861	2.1	782	1.9	90.8
Rochester	32,830	3,605	11.0	280	0.9	7.8
St. Louis	51,059	1,926	3.8	1,856	3.6	96.4
St. Paul	30,972	1,400	4.5	416	1.3	29.7
San Francisco	62,979	773	1.2	500	0.8	64.7
Seattle	41,383	808	2.0	742	1.8	91.8
Toledo	42,922	1,222	2.9	665	1.5	54.4
Tulsa	44,691	3,953[a]	8.9	1,824	4.1	46.1
Mean[b]	137,188	4,681	3.4	2,579	1.9	55.1

[a] Estimated new referrals.

[b] Column percent means do not total exactly to grand means because of rounding.

Table 9

Number of New Referrals Indexed to
Current Special Education Enrollments

District	Current Handicapped Enrollment	New Referrals Number	New Referrals Percent
Albuquerque	9,330	5,209	55.8
Baltimore	18,918	5,344	28.2
Boston	10,617	2,902	27.3
Buffalo	8,161	2,463	30.2
Chicago	45,054	13,000[a]	28.9
Cleveland	5,724	1,139	19.9
Columbus	6,789	1,501	22.1
Dade County	21,803	3,000[a]	13.8
Dallas	9,364	1,500[a]	16.0
Denver	4,811	4,086	84.9
DC	7,392	1,664	22.5
Indianapolis	6,859	1,508	22.0
Long Beach	4,051	1,200[a]	29.6
Los Angeles	46,492	23,721	51.0
Memphis	12,144	600	4.9
Milwaukee	8,509	3,841	45.1
New Orleans	7,252	4,356	60.1
New York City	107,527	33,855	31.5
Omaha	5,590	2,237	40.0
Philadelphia	24,989	3,394	13.6
Pittsburgh	6,147	861	14.0
Rochester	4,766	3,605	75.6
St. Louis	6,745	1,926	28.6
St. Paul	4,994	1,400	28.0
San Francisco	6,431	773	12.0
Seattle	4,277	808	18.9
Toledo	4,751	1,222	25.7
Tulsa	5,684	3,953	69.5
Mean	14,828	4,681	31.6

[a]Estimated new referrals.

Close examination of the placement rates (indexed by the number of referrals) also produces dramatic findings. As reported in Table 8, the percentage of referred students who were actually placed in special education programs ranged from 7.8 to 96.4 percent with a mean of 55.1 percent.

The referral and evaluation process represents a sizeable investment in district staff time and resources. Besides the investment in testing students, staff must review and consider the assessment results, develop a recommended plan of action, and attend an IEP conference. As indicated in Table 10, the conference alone involves a minimum of two district staff members and most often others participate as well. When significant percentages of referrals do not result in special education placements, valuable and limited resources are not efficiently used.

In addition, most districts (90.9 percent) expect special education to provide either formal (9.1 percent) or informal (81.8 percent) consultative support to the classroom teachers of students referred but not placed in special education programs (see Table 11). Although the assistance is most likely short-term, it does represent another demand on special education resources.

All districts who reported high placement rates (greater than 75 percent) uniformly reported required pre-referral activities that helped to lower the number of inappropriate referrals. Table 12 describes various required and optional pre-referral activities. In many cases, districts insisted that classroom teachers implement and document interventions prior to referral to special education. Other districts identified liaisons or established school building committees who were responsible for consultation and/or review regarding potential student referrals. All of these

Table 10

Required and Optional Participants in Initial IEP Meetings

Participants / District	Administrator	Spec. Ed. Coord/ Supervisor	Child Study Team Rep.	Principal (designee)	Referral/ Classroom Teacher	Spec. Ed. Teacher/ Specialist	Psychologist Assess. Team	Social Worker	MD/Nurse	Parent	Child (if appropriate)	Other
Albuquerque[a]		*		X	O		O		O	X	X[f]	O
Atlanta			*	X	X	X	X	O		X		O
Baltimore[b]		*					O			X		O
Boston	*	O	O	O	X	X	O	O	O	O	O	O
Buffalo			*		X	X	X	O	O	X		
Chicago		O		*	X	X	X	X	X	X		O
Cleveland		O		X	X	O	O		O	X	X[f]	
Columbus[c]		X		X	X	X				X		O
Dade County[d]		O	X	X	X	X	X	O	O	X	X[f]	X
Dallas	*				X	X	X		O	X		O
Denver	X	O		X	O	X	X	X	O	O	O	O
Detroit	O	O	X	O	X	X	O[e]	O[e]	O[e]	X	X[f]	O[e]
DC		X	X			X	X			X	X[f]	X
Indianapolis					X	X	X	O	O	X	X[f]	X
Long Beach				*	X	O	X	O	O	X	O	O
Los Angeles	*				O	X	O		O	X	O	O
Memphis				X	X	X	O	O		X		X
Milwaukee	X				O	*				X	X[f]	O
Minneapolis				X	X	X	O	*	O	X	O	O
Nashville				X	X	X	X			X	X[f]	X
New York City				O	O	X	X	O	X	X	X[f]	X
New Orleans					X			O		X	X[f]	X
Omaha			X		X					X	X[f]	*
Philadelphia		O		X	X		X			X		
Pittsburgh		X		O	X	O	X	O	O	X	O	O
Portland		X			X	X	O	O		X		O
Rochester		X		O	X	X	X	O	X	X		
St. Louis	O	X	O	X	O	*	O	O	O	X	O	O
St. Paul	O	O		X	X	X	O	O	O	X	O[f]	O
San Francisco	X				X	X	X			X	X[f]	
Seattle	O				X	*	X			X	X[f]	X
Toledo		X		X	X		*			X		
Tulsa	X				X	X	O			X		O

Note: X=required, O=optional, and *=chairperson.

[a]Two of the optional are required.

[b]Depends on nature of student's handicap.

[c]Special education supervisor, principal, or designee and teacher (present or proposed).

[d]Representative of district other than student's teacher.

[e]Dependent on classification of student.

[f]Dependent on age of student.

*Chairperson.

Table 11

Role of Special Education for Students
Referred but Not Placed

Role	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Provide consultative support to classroom teacher	27	81.8
Develop formal recommendations or plan	3	9.1
None	3	9.1
Total Responding	33	100.0

Table 12

Required and Optional Pre-Referral
Special Education Activities

Activities	Required		Optional	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Consultation with principal or committee	20	60.6	0	0
Classroom attempted intervention	17	51.5	7	21.2
Parent-teacher discussion	8	24.2	0	0
Completion of referral packet or forms	7	21.2	0	0
Screening	0	0	3	9.1
Other	0	0	1	3.0
None identified	3	9.1	24	72.7
Total Responding[a]	33	100.0	33	100.0

[a]Districts responded with more than one activity.

pre-referral activities were aimed at intervening at the regular education classroom level and providing quality control for special education referrals.

When special education directors were asked for recommendations for state and federal policy makers (see Table 22), many (16 or 51.6 percent) focused on one aspect or another related to the referral, evaluation, and placement process. Nine of the 31 (29.0 percent) recommended clarifications or revisions in handicapped classifications, seven (22.6 percent) suggested loosening the special education IEP process, and five (16.1 percent) called for an overall reduction in the restrictiveness of special education regulations. Given the demand that is made on limited special education resources by a large number of referrals and moderate placement rates, it is not surprising that at least half of the districts advocated changes in the special education referral, evaluation, and placement process.

C. Exit from Special Education Programs

As noted above, data were collected on the percentages and reasons for handicapped students leaving special education programs. Table 13 reports that approximately 18.2 percent of those placed leave special education programs. Given that special education programs average approximately 9.1 percent of district enrollments, this means that 1.7 percent of the district enrollments leave special education programs.

There is great variation from one district to the next in the number of handicapped students leaving. Although the statistics reported in Table 13 are somewhat confounded by districts' inconsistencies in reporting practices (e.g., inclusion or exclusion of speech impaired students returning to regular education), the exit rates of districts range from 2.8 to 39.1 percent.

Table 13

Reasons for Students Leaving Special Education Programs

District	Special Education Enrollment	Returned to General Educational Program		Graduated from High School		Moved out of District		Entered Private or Parochial School		Withdrew from School		No Longer School Age		Other		Total	
	#	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%
Albuquerque	9,330	234	2.5	235	2.5	a	-	a	-	674	7.2	0	0	0	0	1,143	12.3
Atlanta	4,454	b	-	140	3.1	b	-	b	-	13	0.3	12	0.3	289	6.5	454	10.2
Boston	10,617	406	3.8	325	3.1	703	6.6	179	1.7	869	8.2	0	0	58	0.5	2,540	23.9
Buffalo	8,161	435	5.3	64	0.8	0	0	0	0	247	3.0	4	<0.1	0	0	750	9.2
Chicago	45,054	6,023	13.4	1,678	3.7	1,150	2.6	558	1.2	417	0.9	85	0.2	28	<0.1	9,939	22.1
Cleveland	5,724	50	0.9	425	7.4	5	<0.1	0	0	25	0.4	5	<0.1	0	0	510	8.9
Columbus	6,789	45	0.7	240	3.5	392	5.8	54	0.8	156	2.3	0	0	0	0	887	13.1
Dade County	21,803	600	2.8	650	3.0	1,214	5.6	479	2.2	1,233	5.7	20	0.1	0	0	4,196	19.2
Dallas	9,364	854	9.1	275	2.9	858	9.2	0	0	206	2.2	25	0.3	0	0	2,218	23.7
Denver	4,811	384	8.0	94	2.0	369	7.7	a,c	-	77	1.6	8	0.2	120	2.5	1,052	21.9
Detroit	16,616	976	5.9	336	2.0	775	4.7	755	4.5	323	1.9	187	1.1	0	0	3,352	20.2
DC	7,392	4	<0.1	63	0.9	57	0.8	5	<0.1	13	0.2	29	0.4	33	0.4	204	2.8
Indianapolis	6,859	85	1.2	170	2.5	311	4.5	2	<0.1	200	2.9	28	0.4	0	0	796	11.6
Long Beach	4,051	22	0.5	175	4.3	90	2.2	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	287	7.1
Los Angeles	46,492	1,329	2.9	6,156	13.2	2,093	4.5	51	0.1	6	<0.1	0	0	0	0	9,635	20.7
Memphis	12,144	100	0.8	303	2.5	0	0	0	0	120	1.0	547	4.5	0	0	1,070	8.8
Milwaukee	8,509	1,107	13.0	280	3.3	1,779	20.9	c	-	141	1.7	20	0.2	0	0	3,327	39.1
Minneapolis	4,859	0	0	79	1.6	0	0	0	0	329	6.8	0	0	0	0	408	8.4
New Orleans	7,752	175	2.3	28	0.4	209	2.7	87	1.1	135	1.7	9	0.1	849	11.0	1,492	19.2
New York City	107,527	3,833	3.6	1,500	1.4	4,371	4.1	1,745	1.6	5,403	5.0	257	0.2	3,351	3.1	20,460	19.0
Philadelphia	24,989	1,987	8.0	1,219	4.9	998	4.0	892	3.6	30	0.1	145	0.6	27	0.1	5,298	21.2
Pittsburgh	6,147	86	1.4	140	2.3	248	4.0	104	1.7	108	1.7	145	2.4	0	0	831	13.5
Rochester	4,766	210	4.4	19	0.4	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	229	4.8
St. Louis	6,745	167	2.5	190	2.8	120	1.8	33	0.5	233	3.4	19	0.3	51	0.8	813	12.1
St. Paul	4,994	38	0.8	305	6.1	26	0.5	18	0.4	15	0.3	23	0.4	4	<0.1	429	8.6
San Francisco	6,431	222	3.5	158	2.5	178	2.8	88	1.4	399	6.2	21	0.3	0	0	1,066	16.6
Mean	15,476	775	4.8	586	3.8	664	4.0	230	1.3	437	2.8	61	0.4	185	1.2	2,823	18.2

a = Included in "withdrew from school."
b = Included in "other."
c = Included in "moved out of district."

Of perhaps more interest are the reasons for handicapped students leaving special education programs. The largest percentage was in the category "returned to general educational program" (4.8 percent). In checking with districts that reported comparatively higher percentages in this category their counts generally included speech impaired students who returned to regular education. Unfortunately, many of the responding districts excluded these students from their counts and so these data are a conservative estimate.

The next two most frequent reasons for leaving special education programs were "moved out of district" (4.0 percent) and "graduated from high school" (3.8 percent). Another 2.8 percent "withdrew from school," 1.3 percent "entered private or parochial school," and .40 percent "were no longer school age." These data support the notion that once students are classified handicapped, most will remain in special education programs for the remainder of their education.

Districts were questioned about the follow-up support they provide for handicapped students who leave special education programs. As reported in Table 14, 29 of the 33 responding districts (87.9 percent) provided some monitoring and consultation. Only ten of the districts (30.3 percent) reported formal monitoring or use of a transition plan. Seventeen (51.5 percent) relied on informal monitoring or consultation while two (6.1 percent) did not specify what type of follow-up was provided.

D. Participation in Vocational Education Programs

Districts were asked to report the percentage of non-handicapped and handicapped students enrolled in vocational education programs. Overall, approximately 17.9 percent of non-handicapped students were enrolled in

Table 14

Type of Follow-Up Support Provided to
Students Leaving Special Education Programs

Type of Follow-Up Support	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Informal monitoring or consultation	17	51.5
Formal monitoring or transition plan	10	30.3
Follow-up provided--unspecified	2	6.1
No follow-up provided	4	12.1
Total Responding	33	100.0

vocational education while slightly over 11 percent of handicapped students participated (see Table 15). In only 7 of the 28 districts (25.0 percent) did the percentage of handicapped students match or exceed the percentage of non-handicapped students. In the remaining 21 districts (75.0 percent), handicapped students were enrolled less frequently in vocational education programs.

The survey also collected information on the types of training provided to vocational education staff who teach handicapped students. As summarized in Table 16, all but one of the 30 responding districts reported that staff received some special training, either in the form of coursework (13.3 percent) or inservice/workshops focused on instruction (26.6 percent), behavior management (16.7 percent), or unspecified topics (53.3 percent). A third provided consultation assistance. One district reported that it required a dual certification in vocational and special education.

Information on vocational education staff involvement in the IEP process also was gathered and is presented in Table 17. All but three of the responding 30 districts (10.0 percent) reported that vocational education staff have some involvement. In nine districts (30.0 percent), the vocational education staff participated directly in the development of the IEP. In some districts, they conducted vocational assessments (26.7 percent) and/or provided input in the development of IEPs (53.3 percent).

E. Involvement in District Decision-Making

Special education programs involve a significant proportion of district staff, students, and resources. As a result, this study examined the involvement of special education in district decision-making.

Table 15

Non-Handicapped Versus Handicapped Student Enrollment
in Vocational Education Programs

District	District Enrollment			Special Education Enrollment		
	Total	Voc Ed	Percent	Total	Voc Ed	Percent
Albuquerque	77,222	16,525	21.4	9,330	1,586	17.0
Atlanta	66,570	15,154	22.8	4,454	989	22.2
Baltimore	112,000	28,276	25.2	18,918	1,525	8.1
Boston	56,748	8,000	14.1	10,617	1,500	14.1
Buffalo	46,619	31,190	66.9	8,161	1,980	24.3
Chicago	428,038	124,700	29.1	45,054	8,282	18.4
Cleveland	74,171	5,935	8.0	5,724	479	8.3
Columbus	67,651	9,156	13.5	6,789	324	4.8
Dade County	228,062	52,000	22.8	21,803	7,000	32.1
Dallas	130,416	34,534	26.5	9,364	1,660	17.8
Denver	57,727	10,157	17.6	4,811	1,087	22.6
Detroit	189,651	2,880	1.5	16,616	635	3.8
Indianapolis	54,042	3,035	5.6	6,859	247	3.6
Long Beach	61,940	9,700	15.7	4,051	305	7.5
Los Angeles	560,264	75,000	13.4	46,492	1,255	2.7
Memphis	104,935	29,348	28.0	12,144	2,220	18.3
Minneapolis	37,456	1,768	4.7	4,859	445	9.2
Nashville	63,346	16,668	26.3	7,189	1,217	16.9
New Orleans	81,393	18,926	23.3	7,252	238	3.3
New York City	932,880	140,802	15.1	107,527	8,582	8.0
Omaha	41,632	4,410	10.6	5,590	612	10.9
Philadelphia	197,980	24,760	12.5	24,989	2,874	11.5
Pittsburgh	40,257	4,507	11.2	6,147	415	6.8
Portland	50,986	3,120	6.1	5,406	309	5.7
St. Louis	51,059	2,966	5.8	6,745	155	2.3
St. Paul	30,972	8,849	28.6	4,994	536	10.7
Seattle	41,383	15,897	38.4	4,277	841[a]	19.7
Toledo	42,922	6,149	14.3	4,751	171	3.6
Mean	140,297	25,158	17.9	15,033	1,695	11.3

[a]Duplicated count.

Table 16

Type of Training Provided to Vocational Education Staff Who Teach Handicapped Students

Type of Training	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Coursework	4	13.3
Inservice or workshops--unspecified topics	16	53.3
Inservice or workshops--instructional focus	8	26.6
Inservice or workshops--behavioral focus	5	16.7
Consultation assistance	10	33.3
Special education teaching certificate required	1	3.3
No training	1	3.3
Total Responding[a]	30	100.0

[a]Districts responded with more than one type of training.

Table 17

Vocational Education Staff Involvement in IEP Process

Type of Involvement	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Participate directly in IEP process	9	30.0
Conduct vocational assessment or evaluation	8	26.7
Provide input to IEP process	16	53.3
Have limited or no involvement	3	10.0
Total Responding[a]	30	100.0

[a]Districts responded with more than one type of involvement.

As a first indicator, the proximity of the individual responsible for special education to the superintendent in the district hierarchy was examined. Table 18 shows that in over half of the 28 responding districts, special education was located within one (2 or 7.1 percent) or two (15 or 53.6 percent) management levels of the superintendent. The remaining districts ranged from three (8 or 28.6 percent), four (2 or 7.1 percent), or five (1 or 3.6 percent) levels from the superintendent. In general, special education programs enjoyed high management status in Council school districts.

Management level within the district hierarchy does not ensure involvement in district decision-making, however. Consequently, special education divisions were asked to rate the level of joint planning that occurs between regular and special education. As summarized in Table 19, two of the districts (7.1 percent) reported high levels of joint planning, 19 (67.9 percent) reported moderate levels, five (17.9 percent) varied levels, and 2 (7.1 percent) minimal or none.

On another issue, districts were asked to indicate the level of impact of special education on school space and facility utilization (see Table 20). In response to this question, 12 districts (41.4 percent) reported great impact, 10 (34.5 percent) reported moderate impact, 2 (6.9 percent) varied impact, and 5 (17.2 percent) minimal or no impact. However, of the 22 that reported great or moderate impact, slightly over half (12 or 54.5 percent) noted that special education classrooms in regular education buildings were a source of difficulty because of limited space and the relatively low number of students assigned to special education classrooms. Many reported that special education classrooms were moved or assigned to

Table 18

Location of Special Education in School District Organization

District	Management Titles							Management Levels Between - Superintendent and Special Education Manager
	Supt.	Deputy Supt.	Assoc. Supt.	Asst. Supt.	Executive Director	Director	Adm.	
Albuquerque	X	X		—		X		2
Atlanta	X		X	X		X		3
Baltimore[a]	X			X				2
Buffalo	X		X	X				2
Chicago	X	X	X	X		X		4
Columbus	X			X				2
Dade County	X	X	X	X	X			4
Dallas[a]	X	X					X	3
Denver	X	X				X		2
Detroit[b]	X	X			X			3
DC	X	X	X	X				3
Indianapolis	X			X				1
Long Beach	X	X				X		2
Los Angeles	X	X	X	X		X	X	5
Memphis[a]	X					X		2
Milwaukee	X	X		X				2
Minneapolis[b]	X	X				X		3
New Orleans	X			X				1
New York City[c]	X	X					X	2
Philadelphia	X	X			X			2
Pittsburgh[d]	X			X		X		2
Portland[d]	X	X		X		X		3
Rochester[a,e]	X					X		2
St. Louis	X		X			X		2
St. Paul	X		X			X	X	3
Seattle	X			X		X		2
Toledo	X			X	X	X		3
Tulsa	X		X			X		2

[a]Second-level management title not listed on organizational chart.

[b]Third-level management title not listed on organizational chart.

[c]NYC uses "chancellor" instead of "superintendent" title and "chief administrator" instead of "administrator."

[d]Portland uses "executive deputy superintendent" instead of "deputy superintendent" title, and "assistant director" instead of "director."

[e]Rochester uses "supervising director" instead of "director" title.

Table 19

Degree of District-Level Joint Planning
Concerning Special Education Students

Degree of Joint Planning	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
High	2	7.1
Moderate	19	67.9
Varied	5	17.9
Minimal or none	2	7.1
Total Responding	28	100.0

Table 20

Degree of Special Education Impact on
School Space and Facility Utilization

Degree of Impact	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Great	12	41.4
Moderate	10	34.5
Varied	2	6.9
Minimal or none	5	17.2
Total Responding	29	100.0

non-classroom space as a way to accommodate regular education classrooms. If the issue of classroom space is a representative example, special education appears not to have influence equal to regular education in district decision-making.

F. Impact Data to Evaluate Special Education Programs

Evaluation of special education programs is of increasing interest to special education program directors, superintendents, boards of education, and other constituents. This survey gathered data on current evaluation practices and evaluation needs of Council school districts. Table 21 summarizes their responses to both.

In terms of evaluation practices, 64.5 percent of the districts reported that they conduct evaluations of discrete program components that generally focused on program activities and procedures and not on student outcomes (e.g., activities of early childhood special education classroom teachers, staff perceptions and ratings of program procedures and materials, evaluation of vocational program services). Approximately 42 percent reported evaluations to monitor compliance with state and/or federal regulations. Approximately 29 percent reported that evaluations were conducted to determine program effectiveness or success based primarily on student outcomes as categorized by studies of handicapped student achievement of other outcomes (22.6 percent) or longitudinal studies of programs for handicapped students (9.7 percent).

When asked what evaluation needs exist, districts focused either on additional studies to evaluate program component effectiveness (33.3 percent) or to assess student outcomes (55.5 percent) as categorized by studies of handicapped student achievement (33.3 percent) or longitudinal studies

Table 21

Current and Needed Special Education Evaluations

Type of Evaluation	Currently Conducted		Need to be Conducted	
	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Program component effectiveness	20	64.5	9	33.3
Local/state compliance monitoring	13	41.9	1	3.7
Student achievement/outcomes	7	22.6	9	33.3
Student population characteristics/MIS	6	19.4	0	0
Effectiveness of referral, assessment, and placement process	4	12.9	3	11.1
Curriculum	3	9.7	1	3.7
New or pilot programs	3	9.7	0	0
Cost-effectiveness studies	3	9.7	2	7.4
Longitudinal student outcome studies	3	9.7	6	22.2
Staff performance	2	6.5	0	0
Treatment effectiveness for specific handicapped populations	2	6.5	7	25.9
Other	12	38.7	6	22.2
None	1	3.2	1	3.7
Total Responding[a]	31	10.00	27	100.0

[a]Districts responded with more than one evaluation study.

(22.2 percent). Districts clearly are interested in determining the effectiveness of their special education programs for handicapped students.

G. Recommendations for Special Education Policy Makers

In a final, open-ended survey question, districts were asked to generate recommendations for state and federal policy makers. Thirty-one of the 33 districts (93.9 percent) offered a variety of recommendations that are summarized in Table 22. Not unexpectedly, 24 (77.4 percent) of the district recommendations focused on increasing funds to match program mandates.

A total of 18 of the 31 districts (58.1 percent) focused their recommendations on modifications broadly related to P.L. 94-142 regulations. More specifically, eight districts (25.8 percent) called for clarification or revision of handicapped classifications, seven districts (22.6 percent) suggested modifications in the referral, evaluation, and placement process, six districts (19.4 percent each) advocated an increase in flexibility for program spending or a reduction in the restrictiveness of regulations overall, and five districts (16.1 percent) recommended options be explored for integrating regular and special education. These recommendations strongly reflect the districts' position that they must have more flexibility to meet the needs of handicapped students.

Other recommendations listed by the group included reductions in reporting requirements (6 or 19.4 percent), increases in transitional programs (4 or 12.9 percent), assistance in training special educators (3 or 9.7 percent), and dissemination of promising practices (2 or 6.5 percent).

Table 22

Special Education Recommendations for
State and Federal Policy Makers

Recommendation	Number of Districts	Percent of Districts
Increase funds to match program mandates	24	77.4
Clarify or revise handicapped classifications	8	25.8
Modify special education referral and evaluation process	7	22.6
Increase flexibility for program spending	6	19.4
Reduce restrictiveness of special education regulations	6	19.4
Reduce reporting requirements	6	19.4
Explore options for integrating regular and special education programs	5	16.1
Increase opportunities for transitional programs, including from home to school and school to adult	4	12.9
Assist in training of special educators	3	9.7
Disseminate promising practices	2	6.5
Other	10	32.3
Total Responding[a]	31	100.0

[a]Districts responded with more than one recommendation.

IV. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This study identified a variety of critical issues confronting members of the Council of Great City Schools in the delivery, management, and evaluation of special education programs to students. These issues are discussed below and should stimulate additional discussion by Council members. The chapter also presents recommendations for future Council studies related to special education.

A. Critical Issues

The critical issues identified by the study's results include:

- comparison of special education programs across districts
- impact of the referral, evaluation, and placement process on district resources
- use of the specific learning disabled classification
- referral of at-risk students to special education
- enrollment of handicapped students in vocational education programs
- evaluation of handicapped student outcomes.

Each of these issues is discussed in more detail below.

1. Comparison of Special Education Programs Across Districts

As reported in the previous chapter, there are widespread differences in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 by the members of the Council of the Great City Schools. Significant differences were reported among districts in the percentage of handicapped students served, the classification and placement of handicapped children, the provision of related services, and the funding of special education programs. These results point to the

differences across districts in their interpretation and implementation of P.L. 94-142.

Variations in local districts' implementation of P.L. 94-142 should not necessarily be interpreted as a cause for concern or a call for greater definition of the regulations. Instead, variations occurred as local districts responded to the particular needs, preferences, and services available in their particular area. These variations occurred naturally and often should be commended.

However, local variations in the implementation of P.L. 94-142 do complicate the examination or comparison of special education programs across districts. Indeed, this study was precipitated in part by Council members' interest in developing a broad picture of the status of special education in their districts. Instead, the results of this study argue that such comparisons be made with great caution.

There were very few variables (or categories of information) on which it was possible to define the "typical" district. For example, special education referrals generally averaged approximately 3.4 percent of district enrollments. However, district referrals ranged from a low of less than 1 percent to a high of 11 percent. Obviously, there are a number of local factors affecting the referral rates (e.g., required pre-referral activities). These local factors (or variations in the implementation of P.L. 94-142) complicate the comparison of special education programs across districts.

2. Impact of the Referral, Evaluation, and Placement Process on District Resources

The referral, evaluation, and placement of students in special education programs represents a significant demand on special education resources. As noted above, new referrals are averaging approximately 3.4 percent of district enrollments. Two-thirds of the districts reported that the number of referrals was either remaining the same or increasing. Only one-third reported a decrease in the number of referrals.

When referrals to special education occur, special education must evaluate the student and decide whether to place the student in a special education program. Efficient use of resources dictates that the percentage of students referred and placed should be very high. However, Council members averaged only 55.1 percent. As a result special education programs are expending significant proportions of staff time in conducting evaluations and attending IEP conferences for inappropriate referrals.

Some districts have attempted to attack this problem by initiating required pre-referral activities. All of the districts which reported high placement rates (greater than 75 percent) also reported pre-referral activities that have helped to lower the number of inappropriate referrals. However, more attention to the referral, evaluation, and placement process is needed, especially if referrals continue to grow and resources remain level.

3. Use of the Specific Learning Disabled Classification

The largest number of students identified as handicapped fell in the category of specific learning disabled. Although the national estimates are approximately 4.6 percent (U.S. Department of Education, 1984) 12 of the 30

responding districts (40 percent) reported higher percentages, ranging from 4.7 to 6.9 percent. In approximately one-fourth of the districts included in this study, at least half of the handicapped students are classified specific learning disabled. Yet there does not appear to be any reason to suspect the national estimates or their applicability to large city school districts. It may be that large city school districts are overusing the specific learning disabled classification.

Data gathered from this study are not longitudinal and therefore it cannot be determined whether the number of specific learning disabled students is increasing. In a separate study for the Council of the Great City Schools, Elinow and Lytle (1984) reported that the number of specific learning disabled students is increasing. They blamed this increase on the lack of a clear definition and valid and reliable assessment measures. As a result, it is difficult to distinguish specific learning disabled students from low achievers and poorly motivated students of average ability. If Elinow and Lytle are correct, it then likely that this category is being overused, in particular as placements for average ability students with either poor performance or motivation problems.

4. Referral of At-Risk Students to Special Education

More and more school districts are faced with increasing numbers of students whose educational needs are not being met satisfactorily by regular education programs. These "at-risk" students require special services and programs if they are to remain and progress in school. Special education directors serving on the steering committee for this study strongly believed that an increasing number of these at-risk students are being referred to special education.

As reported above, two-thirds of the districts reported that referrals are either remaining the same or increasing, and few districts reported sizeable numbers of students leaving these programs. Considered together, these two statistics seem to point to an increase in the number of students in special education programs. If these findings are combined with the suspected over- or misuse of the specific learning disabled category, it seems likely that the increase in referrals and placements may be accounted for at least partially by at-risk students. In addition, given the increased attention to accountability in regular education programs, the referral of "poor-achieving" at-risk students to special education and the automatic exclusion of these students from district analyses of test scores, the possibility becomes even stronger. Special education instructional strategies that rely on low student-teacher ratios and individualized programs may be appropriate for these at-risk students. However, these and other strategies can be used by districts in their regular education programs to address the educational needs of at-risk students. It is not necessary to misclassify and transfer these students to special education programs.

5. Enrollment of Handicapped Students in Vocational Education Programs

Information was collected on the percentage of non-handicapped and handicapped students participating in vocational education programs. As reported above, participation of handicapped students is generally far below that of non-handicapped students. Although there are some districts in which the reverse is true, approximately three-fourths of the districts reported lower percentages. Given the legal mandates for equal access and participation, it seems clear that a sizeable number of the districts are not in compliance and must begin to address this issue.

6. Evaluation of Student Outcomes

When asked what evaluation needs existed, over half of the districts reported that they needed information that assessed the successfulness of their programs in terms of student outcomes. They are interested in assessing the achievement of handicapped students on both an annual and long-term basis. They also are interested in determining the comparative success of different treatments for particular handicapped populations.

Addressing these evaluation needs is not simply a matter of reordering evaluation resources to meet priorities, however. As some districts noted, appropriate evaluation criteria are difficult to establish for many special education programs or handicapped student groups. Few handicapped students leave special education programs and so analyses of exit counts are not feasible. Achievement norms do not exist on which to compare handicapped student progress. Comparison or control groups to establish the efficacy of treatment services and levels are not possible because of ethical and legal issues surrounding the denial of service. In many cases, instructional programs for students are designed to meet individual student needs that complicate aggregation or respond to other issues less relevant to the students' presenting handicap (e.g., state reimbursement formulas, parental insistence for specific services). Too often, there is not a clear and predictable relationship among a student's classification, educational needs, instructional program placement, and expected versus actual progress.

Evaluation of the success of special education programs within this context is not an easy undertaking. However, it is an issue that districts must begin to attack, especially given the increasing demands on special education programs and district budgets.

B. Recommendations for Future Work

Special education programs have changed radically since the passage of P.L. 94-142 in 1975. Although initially considered a civil rights law, P.L. 94-142 has changed the delivery and management of special education services in school districts across the country. As evidenced by the results of this study, members of the Council of the Great City Schools are faced with increasing demands for their services, limited funding, and limited research data to demonstrate the successfulness of their programs.

This study provides a broad description or status report on special education in member districts. However, the results of this study pose as many questions as they answer. In order to gain a more complete understanding, additional investigation and study is needed in a variety of areas. The following areas serve as the basis for the study's recommendations listed and described below:

- development of longitudinal descriptive data base on special education programs
- exploration of options to integrate regular and special education programs
- identification and dissemination of successful school district practices.

1. Development of Longitudinal Descriptive Data Base

Collection of the data for this study represented an ambitious undertaking by Council members. It is highly unlikely that such a comprehensive data base has been gathered before. This study and the resulting data base symbolize the interest and commitment of Council members to gather and share information on the operations and management of their special education programs.

This study is only a first step, however. Many of the critical issues facing special education involve changes over time, and longitudinal data are needed to understand the complexity of the situation fully. For example, the data seem to indicate that special education referrals are increasing, but it is impossible to substantiate these increases without collecting data over time.

As noted above, this study was conducted in order to provide a broad description on the status of special education. During the course of the study, a number of other questions (or issues) emerged, such as the referral of at-risk students to special education programs. Since these questions were not considered as the study was being designed, it was difficult to respond to these issues directly. By continuing to collect information and expand the data base, Council members can begin to address them.

2. Integration of Regular and Special Education Programs

Over half of the recommendations identified by Council member districts focused on revamping P.L. 94-142. In particular, districts were concerned with reducing the restrictiveness of federal law in terms of meeting students' educational needs. Districts' concerns stemmed from their suspicions concerning a number of factors, including an increase in the number of special education referrals, the misuse and overuse of the specific learning disabled classification, the referral of at-risk students to special education programs, and the overlap and commonality of instructional approaches for mildly handicapped, disadvantaged, and low performing students. At the heart of these issues is the inappropriate referral of low achieving students to special education.

Many of the Council districts believe that these issues must be addressed by regular and special education together. One possible approach which merits additional attention is the integration of regular education programs for low performing students with special education programs for mildly handicapped students. Although not yet a reality, a number of the Council members (e.g., Dallas, Philadelphia) have begun exploring options to reduce the barriers between regular and special education programs for these students. These efforts should be carefully watched by all Council members. In addition, the Council should support further study and discussion around this option.

3. Identification and Dissemination of Successful Practices

A separate part of this study was the identification of successful programs and practices of Council members. Although the publication of these practices is not yet completed, it is evident that many of the districts have developed innovative and successful ways to deal with problems facing special education. These programs and practices, once identified and documented, should be disseminated to all Council members for their consideration and use. One of the benefits of Council membership is the opportunity to discuss common problems and share approaches for dealing with these problems. The special education group should follow through on the identification and dissemination phase of this study, especially in areas found by this study to be particularly problematic.

REFERENCES

Elinow, Alvin and Lytle, James H. Practices and Procedures Used in Assessing and Providing Programs for LD Students: A Survey of the Council of the Great City Schools. Washington, D. C.: The Council of the Great City Schools, 1984.

U.S. Department of Education, Office of Special Education and Rehabilitative Services. Sixth Annual Report to Congress on the Implementation of Public Law 94-142, 1984 and unpublished tabulation. Washington, D.C.: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1984.

APPENDIX

Special Education Survey

Council of Great City Schools

Special Education Survey

Please return one completed copy of your district's survey form by February 21, 1986. Part I requests copies of reports and other documents to be returned with the survey. Part II contains questions about special education and related programs. In all cases, the term special education refers to the Federal definition and excludes the mentally gifted category. If you have any questions, do not hesitate to call for clarification. Address inquiries and completed surveys to Keith Kershner or Joan Buttram:

Evaluation Services
Research for Better Schools
444 North Third Street
Philadelphia, PA 19123
(215) 574-9300

Your cooperation in completing this survey is greatly appreciated. Results should begin to be available to you by April 15, 1986.

Please designate a liaison person in your district for follow-up on this survey, should it be necessary.

Name	Address
District	
Title	Telephone

PART I

Please attach a copy of the documents listed below. Since this study will describe the most recent completed school year - 1984-85 - the documents should cover that period of time.

1. P.L. 94-142 report to the SEA indicating the numbers of children receiving special education and related services by handicapping disability and age category.

2. P.L. 89-313 report to the SEA indicating the numbers of children entering your district from private placements by handicapping disability and age category.

3. Compliance report to the Office of Civil Rights indicating numbers of children receiving special education and related services by handicapping condition and race. (Due to reporting cycles the latest report may not be for the 1984-85 school year.)

4. Your district system-wide organizational chart indicating reporting line for special education department within the overall school system.

5. Your special education department organizational chart indicating subdivisions.

6. Your district operating budget summary indicating the direct cost bottom line and categorical funding reimbursements.

7. Your special education department budget summary indicating categories of direct cost allocation (e.g., administration, instruction, transportation, supplies, consultant services) and state reimbursements.

8. Descriptive information on a special education instructional program or practice you want to share with other districts - send printed material and/or a brief written summary.

9. Descriptive information on a special education management program or practice you want to share with other districts - send printed material and/or a brief written summary.

10. An evaluation report on special education that you would like to share with other districts.

PART II

1. Student Data

a. Please enter the student enrollment information indicated below.

Student Categories	Number
Total Enrollment in Your District	
Special Education Enrollment in District Facilities	
Special Education Enrollment in Programs Operated by Other Public Agencies	
Special Education Private Day Placements	
Special Education Residential Placements	
Special Education Homebound Instruction	
Total Enrollment in Non-Public Schools in Your District Attendance Area	

2. Staff/Facility Data

a. How many teachers are employed by your district?

Number of Teachers	
Full-Time	
Part-Time	

b. How many aides are employed by your district?

Number of Aides	
Full-Time	
Part-Time	

c. How many special education teachers and aides are employed by special education category?

Special Education Categories	Number of Teachers		Number of Aides	
	Full-Time	Part-Time	Full-Time	Part-Time
Mentally Retarded				
Hard of Hearing				
Deaf				
Speech Impaired				
Visually Handicapped				
Emotionally Handicapped				
Orthopedically Impaired				
Other Health Impaired				
Specific Learning Disabled				
Deaf-Blind				
Multi-Handicapped				
(Other) _____				

d. How many classroom buildings are in operation in your district?

Total Number of Buildings

e. How many classroom buildings are primarily used for special education programs?

Number of Special Ed Buildings

f. What is the impact of special education on school space and facility utilization? _____

_____

_____

_____

3. Fiscal and Budgetary Data

a. What, if any, cost savings measures have you implemented or planned in your special education programs? _____

_____

_____

_____

b. How has the availability of funds affected special education programs? _____

_____

_____

_____

c. If available, how would you use increased funds? _____

_____

_____

_____

4. Pre-Referral, Referral, Placement, and Exit Processes

a. What information is provided to teachers in regular education about the special education referral process? _____

_____

_____

_____

b. What pre-referral activities are mandatory? _____

_____

_____

_____

c. What pre-referral activities are optional? _____

_____

_____

_____

d. Approximately how many students were pre-referred to special education in 1984-85?

Number of Students Pre-Referred

How does this compare with previous years?

Circle one
More, Same, or Less

e. How many students went through the referral process in 1984-85?

Number of Students Referred

How does this compare with previous years?

Circle one
More, Same, or Less

f. How many students were placed in special education programs in 1984-85?

Number of Students Placed

How does this compare with previous years?

Circle one
More, Same, or Less

g. Indicate what specific tests (or diagnostic procedures) typically are given to referred students in each category. Also indicate who (position) is responsible for administering each test.

Special Education Category	Name of Test	Test Administrator
Mentally Retarded		
Hard of Hearing		
Deaf		
Speech Impaired		
Visually Handicapped		
Emotionally Handicapped		
Orthopedically Impaired		
Specific Learning Disabled		
(Other) _____		

h. What is the role of special education for those referred but not placed? _____

_____

_____

i. Who are the required participants in IEP meetings? List participants by position. Place an asterisk (*) next to the chairperson's position.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

j. Are there typically other, non-required participants? List by position.

_____ _____

_____ _____

_____ _____

k. What is the process for periodical re-evaluation of special education students?

_____

_____

_____

l. What are the procedures for identifying students who no longer need special education program placement? _____

_____

_____

_____

m. What follow-up supports are provided to students who leave special education programs? _____

_____

_____

_____

n. How many students left the special education program in 1984-85? Please indicate the numbers for each category of destination.

Categories for Leaving Special Education Program	Number
Returned to general educational program	
Graduated from high school	
Moved out of district	
Entered private or parochial school	
Withdrew from school	
No longer school age	
(Other) _____	

5. Program Evaluation

a. What evaluation activities concerning the special education program are conducted? _____

_____

_____

_____

b. Has a longitudinal evaluation study of any handicapped population been conducted in your district? _____ No _____ Yes If yes, attach executive summary of results to survey.

c. How are evaluation results utilized? _____

_____

_____

_____

d. What additional evaluative information would be most useful to you?

_____

_____

_____

6. Vocational Education Programs

a. For each vocational program in your district, please indicate the numbers of students enrolled--total and special education, the numbers graduating or leaving school in 1984-85, the numbers placed in jobs, and the numbers placed in sheltered workshops.

Vocational Programs	Number Enrolled		Number Leaving in 1984-85		Number Placed in Jobs		Number Placed in Sheltered Workshops
	Total	Spec Ed	Total	Spec Ed	Total	Spec Ed	Spec Ed
Agriculture							
Business							
Industrial Arts							
Health							
Home Economics							
Marketing & DE							
Technical							
Trades & Industrial							
(Other) _____							

b. List the types of jobs in which special education students typically are placed. _____

_____

_____

c. What accommodations or adaptations are employed in vocational programs for special education students? _____

_____

_____

d. What training is given to vocational education staff who teach special education students? _____

_____

_____

e. How do vocational education staff participate in the IEP process?

_____

_____

_____

7. Related Services

a. For each special education related service in your district, please indicate the number of students served; the number of full-time, part-time, and consultant staff; whether the need is increasing, static, or decreasing; and whether or not there is a professional personnel supply shortage.

Related Services	Number of Students	Number of Staff			Need			Shortage	
		Full-Time	Part-Time	Consultants	Incr.	Static	Decr.	Yes	No
Speech Therapy									
Occupational Therapy									
Physical Therapy									
Sign Lang. Interp.									
Psychiatric									
Medical									
(Other) _____									

b. How is eligibility for these services determined? _____

_____

_____

8. Remedial and Compensatory Programs

a. For each remedial and compensatory program in your district, please indicate the total number of students and the number of special education students enrolled. Also indicate whether the program is categorical or an option selected by your district.

Remedial and Compensatory Programs	Number of Students Enrolled		Type of Program	
	Total	Spec Ed	Categorical	Optional
Chapter I Math				
Chapter I Reading				
Chapter I Other _____				
Head Start				
Other Early Childhood				
Limited English Proficiency				
(Other) _____				
(Other) _____				

b. How are the remedial and compensatory programs evaluated for effectiveness? _____

_____

_____

c. Please describe any preschool and primary grade programs in the district designed to reduce remedial and compensatory needs?

d. What district level activities do special and regular education staff jointly conduct?

e. What district level joint planning has taken place concerning special education students?

9. Recommendations

a. What recommendations does your district have for state and federal policy makers with regard to special education?